

In The Matter Of:
Stacy L. Randall v
Reed C. Widen, et al.

Stacy L. Randall
August 28, 2023
Confidential

Colleen Reed Reporting LLC
P.O. Box 293
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53201
www.colleenreed.com

Page 1	Page 3
<p>1 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 2 FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN 3 ----- 4 STACY L. RANDALL, 5 6 Plaintiff, 7 8 -vs- CIVIL ACTION NO. 9 REED C. WIDEN, MICHAEL 22-CV-400 10 KIESLER, WIDEN ENTERPRISES, 11 LLC, and WINDY WATERS, INC., 12 13 Defendants. 14 ----- 15 CONFIDENTIAL - VIDEO DEPOSITION OF: STACY L. RANDALL 16 DATE: August 28, 2023 17 TIME: 9:21 a.m. to 7:02 p.m. 18 LOCATION: Reinhart Boerner Van Deuren, S.C. 19 22 East Mifflin Street, Suite 700 20 Madison, Wisconsin 53703 21 22 REPORTED BY: Ali J. Kornburger 23 24 25</p>	<p>1 I N D E X 2 3 EXAMINATION BY: PAGE 4 Mr. Churchill 6 5 6 EXHIBITS: MARKED 7 Exhibit 1 - Notice of Deposition of Plaintiff 7 8 Stacy L. Randall 9 Complaint 8 10 Exhibit 3 - Plaintiff Stacy L. Randall's 11 Objections and Responses to 12 Defendant's First Requests for 13 Production of Documents 40 14 Exhibit 4 - Shareholder Agreement of Widen 15 Colourgraphics, LTD 55 16 Exhibit 5 - Amendment of Shareholder Agreement 17 of Widen Colourgraphics, LTD, 18 Effective 9/12/2001 77 19 Exhibit 6 - Second Amendment to Shareholder 20 Agreement 105 21 Exhibit 7 - Restated Stock Transfer Agreement 22 Plaintiff Stacy L. Randall's 23 Objections and Responses to 24 Defendant's First Set of 25 Interrogatories 131 26 Exhibit 9 - December 2019 string of text 27 messages 135 28 Exhibit 10 - Screenshot of text messages with 29 Reed Widen 162 30 Exhibit 11 - 2005 Stock Redemption Agreement 175 31 Exhibit 12 - 2007 Stock Redemption Agreement 187 32 Exhibit 13 - 2011 Stock Redemption Agreement 203 33 Exhibit 14 - 2017 Stock Redemption Agreement 212 34 Exhibit 15 - 2019 Stock Redemption Agreement 218 35 Exhibit 16 - Joint Petition for Divorce 220 36 Exhibit 17 - 4/3/19 letter Amy T. Collins to 37 Stacy L. Randall 227 38 Exhibit 18 - Notice of Motion and Motion to 39 Modify Temporary Order 239 40 Exhibit 19 - Notice of Hearing 242 41 Exhibit 20 - Amended Temporary Order 245 42 Exhibit 21 - Text exchange Windy47391 to 47392 279 43 Exhibit 22 - Text message From Stacy Randall to 44 Mark Goff 280 45 Exhibit 23 - Text message from Stacy Randall to</p>
Page 2	Page 4
<p>1 A P P E A R A N C E S 2 REINHART BOERNER VAN DEUREN, S.C., by 3 JESSICA HUTSON POLAKOWSKI, ATTORNEY AT LAW 4 MARK A. CAMELI, ATTORNEY AT LAW 5 DAVID G. PALAY, ATTORNEY AT LAW 6 22 East Mifflin Street, Suite 700 7 Madison, Wisconsin 53703 8 jpolakowski@reinhardtllaw.com 9 mcamelii@reinhardtllaw.com 10 dpalay@reinhardtllaw.com 11 appeared on behalf of the Plaintiff. 12 13 HOLLAND & KNIGHT, LLP, by 14 MARK H. CHURCHILL, ATTORNEY AT LAW 15 1650 Tysons Boulevard, Suite 1700 16 Tysons, Virginia 22102 17 mark.churchill@hklaw.com 18 appeared on behalf of the Defendants. 19 20 HOLLAND & KNIGHT, LLP, by 21 SARAH MORAIN, ATTORNEY AT LAW 22 1650 Tysons Boulevard, Suite 1700 23 Tysons, Virginia 22102 24 sarah.morain@hklaw.com 25 appeared via telephone on behalf of the Defendants. 26 27 O'NEIL, CANNON, HOLLMAN, DEJONG & LAING, S.C., by 28 CHRISTA D. WITTENBERG, ATTORNEY AT LAW 29 Bank One Plaza, Suite 1400 30 111 East Wisconsin Avenue 31 Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202-4870 32 christa.wittenberg@wilaw.com 33 appeared on behalf of the Defendants. 34 35 ALSO PRESENT: 36 37 Mark Lyle, Videographer 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45</p>	<p>1 Exhibit 24 - Text message from Stacy Randall to 284 2 Mark Goff 3 Exhibit 25 - Text message from Stacy Randall to 285 4 Mark Goff 5 Exhibit 26 - Email chain Scott Spangler 298 6 Exhibit 27 - Widen Financial Statements 301 7 Consolidated December 31, 2019 8 Exhibit 28 - Text message from Stacy Randall to 313 9 Justin Randall 10 Exhibit 29 - May 13, 2020, Stock Redemption 316 11 Agreement 12 Exhibit 30 - Text message from Stacy Randall to 323 13 Mike Kiesler 14 Exhibit 31 - Text message from Stacy Randall to 325 15 Mike Kiesler 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 (Original transcript supplied to Attorney Christa D. 23 Wittenberg) 24 (Originals of Exhibits 1 through 31 are attached to 25 the original transcript. Scanned copies were provided to all counsel)</p>

Page 5	Page 7
<p>1 TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 2 (<u>Exhibit No. 1</u> was marked.) 3 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Good morning. 4 We're going on the record. The time is 9:21 a.m. 5 The date is August 28th, 2023. This is media unit 6 number 1 of the video recorded deposition of Stacy 7 Randall taken by counsel for the defendants in the 8 matter of Stacy Randall versus Reed Widen, et al. 9 The case is filed in the U.S. District 10 Court for the Western District of Wisconsin, case 11 number 322CV00400JDP. Today we are at the offices of 12 Reinhart Boerner Van Deuren, 22 East Mifflin in 13 Madison, Wisconsin. 14 My name is Mark Lyle. I'm today's 15 videographer with Ryker and Lyle Legal Video Service, 16 and our court reporter is Ali Kornburger who is here 17 on behalf of Colleen Reed Reporting. 18 First we will have counsel introduce 19 themselves and state whom they represent after which 20 the court reporter will swear in the witness. We 21 will begin with the noticing attorney. 22 MR. CHURCHILL: This is Mark Churchill 23 with Holland & Knight, and I represent the defendants 24 Reed Widen, Michael Kiesler, Widen Enterprises, LLC, 25 and Windy Waters, Inc., and on the phone with me from</p>	<p>1 A 9/13/57. 2 Q And this is a standard question when we take 3 depositions, is there anything medically or 4 medication-wise that might cause you to not be 5 able to give your full and honest testimony 6 today? 7 A No, there's not. 8 Q Are you aware that other depositions have been 9 taken in this case? 10 A I am. 11 Q And have you read any of those deposition 12 transcripts? 13 A I have not. 14 Q Ms. Randall, I have handed you what's been 15 marked for identification as defendant's Exhibit 16 <u>1</u> to your deposition. It states that it's a 17 Notice of Deposition of Plaintiff Stacy L. 18 Randall. Have you seen this document before? 19 A I don't believe so. 20 Q Have you seen the Complaint in this case before? 21 A Yes, I have. 22 Q You can put that to the side. So on occasion 23 today there may be documents that I show you for 24 purposes of asking you questions that will have 25 this caption that was on the top there. And so</p>
Page 6	Page 8
<p>1 my firm Holland & Knight as well as Sarah Morain. 2 MS. WITTENBERG: And Christa 3 Wittenberg from O'Neil Cannon on behalf of the 4 defendants as well. 5 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Good morning. Jess 6 Polakowski appearing on behalf of Stacy Randall. 7 Also with me is Mark Cameli and David Palay. 8 STACY L. RANDALL, called as a witness 9 herein, having been first duly sworn on oath, was 10 examined and testified as follows: 11 EXAMINATION 12 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 13 Q Would you please state and spell your name for 14 the record? 15 A Stacy, S-T-A-C-Y, Randall, R-A-N-D-A-L-L. 16 Q And you are the same Stacy Randall that has 17 filed the lawsuit for which we're having your 18 deposition today, correct? 19 A Correct. 20 Q And your maiden name was Widen; is that correct? 21 A That's right. 22 Q And you are the sister of one of the defendants, 23 Reed Widen? 24 A Yes. 25 Q Ms. Randall, what is your date of birth?</p>	<p>1 when we do go over questions like that, that 2 should be an indication it's a filing or 3 document in this case. Have you been deposed 4 before? 5 A Never. 6 Q Okay. 7 (<u>Exhibit No. 2</u> was marked.) 8 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 9 Q We just mentioned the Complaint. I have just 10 handed you now what's been marked for 11 identification as Exhibit <u>2</u> to your deposition. 12 It does state that it's the Complaint at the 13 top. You can flip through that if you would 14 like. I just want to know whether or not you 15 recognize the document. 16 And I will say, Ms. Randall, that there 17 are exhibits that were attached to that document 18 that I have taken off for brevity sake, so the 19 exhibits are missing, but that should be a 20 complete copy, otherwise, of the Complaint you 21 filed in this case. 22 A Yes. I have seen this. I recognize it. 23 Q When was the last time you think you reviewed 24 it? 25 A Last night.</p>

Page 9	Page 11
<p>1 Q You said that you had not been deposed before,</p> <p>2 correct?</p> <p>3 A Correct.</p> <p>4 Q Have you ever been a witness in a case, in a</p> <p>5 legal case?</p> <p>6 A No, I have not.</p> <p>7 Q Have you ever testified in any way?</p> <p>8 A No, I have not.</p> <p>9 Q It probably makes sense, although I'm sure that</p> <p>10 you have been prepared by your counsel for me to</p> <p>11 explain a little bit the rules of the road</p> <p>12 because this is -- although it's kind of</p> <p>13 informal, it's also a formal process. So let's</p> <p>14 go over a little bit of how I hope today can</p> <p>15 proceed.</p> <p>16 A Okay.</p> <p>17 Q As you can tell we have a court reporter here.</p> <p>18 She's taking down everything that I say and</p> <p>19 everything that everybody else says including</p> <p>20 you.</p> <p>21 A Okay.</p> <p>22 Q And it's also being videotaped, and so that will</p> <p>23 ultimately help the court reporter if you and I</p> <p>24 have issues, but I can already tell you're doing</p> <p>25 a great job of waiting until I'm finished</p>	<p>1 Q And if you do answer one of my questions, I'm</p> <p>2 going to understand that you understood my</p> <p>3 question. Is that also fair?</p> <p>4 A Yes.</p> <p>5 Q During the course of the day I do think we will</p> <p>6 be here for a while, so we will want to take</p> <p>7 some breaks. If you need a break for any</p> <p>8 reason, please just ask and that will be totally</p> <p>9 fine. If I have a question that's pending and</p> <p>10 I'm expecting an answer, unless you have a</p> <p>11 medical emergency, I would ask that you try to</p> <p>12 finish the question and then we can break and</p> <p>13 different people need different amounts of time.</p> <p>14 So I certainly am sympathetic to when you will</p> <p>15 need a break.</p> <p>16 A Okay.</p> <p>17 Q Your attorney may also have explained the</p> <p>18 process of objections to questions, and the way</p> <p>19 that works is if I ask a question that your</p> <p>20 counsel finds objectionable based on an</p> <p>21 evidentiary rule, she's going to state her</p> <p>22 objection. And, again, that's a process where</p> <p>23 you have to let her do that, and I will respect</p> <p>24 her right to do that. Her objection may or may</p> <p>25 not make me rephrase my question, but unless</p>
Page 10	Page 12
<p>1 talking to speak. That's going to be important</p> <p>2 because what we do need to be able to do is</p> <p>3 understand what we did today. And so if I'm</p> <p>4 speaking if you could wait until I finish my</p> <p>5 question, and then when you're speaking I will</p> <p>6 wait until you finish your answer. Does that</p> <p>7 makes sense?</p> <p>8 A That sounds good.</p> <p>9 Q And it also is important, that you're already</p> <p>10 doing, is to make sure you give a verbal</p> <p>11 response.</p> <p>12 A Right.</p> <p>13 Q So there may be occasions that you do a "mm-hmm"</p> <p>14 or something like that, and so I might ask you</p> <p>15 what that meant, and I don't mean to be rude.</p> <p>16 A I understand.</p> <p>17 Q You understand also that you're testifying under</p> <p>18 oath, correct?</p> <p>19 A Yes, I do.</p> <p>20 Q There may be times frankly that you don't</p> <p>21 understand one of my questions, and if that's</p> <p>22 the case, feel free to just tell me you don't</p> <p>23 understand, and I will try to rephrase it or</p> <p>24 restate it; is that fair?</p> <p>25 A That sounds good.</p>	<p>1 your counsel instructs you not to answer at all,</p> <p>2 I'm entitled to an answer to my question. Does</p> <p>3 that make sense?</p> <p>4 A Yes.</p> <p>5 Q Do you have any questions?</p> <p>6 A No, I don't.</p> <p>7 Q Let's talk a little bit about your preparation</p> <p>8 for today. Specifically with respect to the</p> <p>9 deposition, what did you do to prepare for</p> <p>10 today's deposition?</p> <p>11 A Well, like I said, I reviewed the Complaint last</p> <p>12 night. I got together with my attorneys three</p> <p>13 times here at the office.</p> <p>14 Q Let's start with you reviewing the Complaint.</p> <p>15 Did you just do that on your own?</p> <p>16 A It was kind of a mutual thing.</p> <p>17 Q Why did you review the Complaint? Were there</p> <p>18 certain parts that you were interested in</p> <p>19 reviewing?</p> <p>20 A There were certain parts that I just didn't</p> <p>21 remember.</p> <p>22 Q And when you say you don't remember, do you mean</p> <p>23 you don't remember the Complaint, or you don't</p> <p>24 remember what's stated in the Complaint?</p> <p>25 A Well, it's been so long. Yes, I definitely</p>

Page 13	Page 15
<p>1 remember the Complaint. I just didn't remember</p> <p>2 some of the exact dates and hopefully that will</p> <p>3 help me today. Maybe it won't. Maybe I still</p> <p>4 won't remember.</p> <p>5 Q Understood. You said that you met on three</p> <p>6 different occasions?</p> <p>7 A Yes.</p> <p>8 Q When you met with counsel, did you meet with</p> <p>9 anybody other than counsel, meaning persons</p> <p>10 other than attorneys?</p> <p>11 A No.</p> <p>12 Q With respect to your deposition today, have you</p> <p>13 discussed that topic with anyone other than</p> <p>14 counsel?</p> <p>15 A My son.</p> <p>16 Q And is that your son Justin?</p> <p>17 A Yes.</p> <p>18 Q Do you have any other children?</p> <p>19 A Yes.</p> <p>20 Q Did you discuss the deposition with anyone other</p> <p>21 than Justin?</p> <p>22 A No.</p> <p>23 Q And what did you talk with Justin about?</p> <p>24 A Well, actually he came to several of the</p> <p>25 meetings when we were -- when we were bringing</p>	<p>1 MR. CHURCHILL: Sure. Could you read</p> <p>2 it back?</p> <p>3 (Last question read back.)</p> <p>4 THE WITNESS: No.</p> <p>5 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>6 Q And I think we will talk about Justin later</p> <p>7 today. So we can come back to that as well.</p> <p>8 Who is Steven Randall, that's your ex-husband?</p> <p>9 A My ex-husband.</p> <p>10 Q Have you spoken with Steven Randall about your</p> <p>11 deposition today?</p> <p>12 A No.</p> <p>13 Q Does he know you're being deposed?</p> <p>14 A No.</p> <p>15 Q When is the last time you spoke with your</p> <p>16 ex-husband about this case?</p> <p>17 A Never.</p> <p>18 Q You have never spoken with your ex-husband about</p> <p>19 this case?</p> <p>20 A Never.</p> <p>21 Q Does he know that you filed the lawsuit?</p> <p>22 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for</p> <p>23 speculation.</p> <p>24 THE WITNESS: I'm not sure.</p> <p>25 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p>
Page 14	Page 16
<p>1 the Complaint -- writing the Complaint up. He</p> <p>2 helped me remember things and -- so he pretty</p> <p>3 much has been in the know all along.</p> <p>4 Q And with respect to today's deposition, what did</p> <p>5 you talk with Justin about?</p> <p>6 A I just asked him to think of me on Tuesday.</p> <p>7 Q Did you talk with him this morning?</p> <p>8 A No.</p> <p>9 Q How old is Justin?</p> <p>10 A He's 42.</p> <p>11 Q My dad forgot my birthday almost every year. No</p> <p>12 judgment.</p> <p>13 A It's the mom's job.</p> <p>14 Q Are there particular parts of your Complaint</p> <p>15 that Justin is helping you remember? You</p> <p>16 indicated that he helped you a little bit with</p> <p>17 respect to remembering some facts. Are there</p> <p>18 particular portions of the Complaint that he's</p> <p>19 helping you remember?</p> <p>20 MS. POLAKOWSKI: I'm going to lodge an</p> <p>21 objection here and just caution you not to reveal the</p> <p>22 contents of things we have talked about with you --</p> <p>23 we attorneys.</p> <p>24 THE WITNESS: Can you repeat the</p> <p>25 question, please?</p>	<p>1 Q You had a divorce proceeding with Mr. Randall,</p> <p>2 correct?</p> <p>3 A Yes.</p> <p>4 Q This lawsuit never came up in your divorce</p> <p>5 proceeding?</p> <p>6 A No.</p> <p>7 Q Didn't you have to disclose in your divorce</p> <p>8 proceeding that you had payments with respect to</p> <p>9 the May 2020 redemption agreement?</p> <p>10 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for</p> <p>11 a legal conclusion.</p> <p>12 THE WITNESS: Can you repeat the</p> <p>13 question? I'm sorry.</p> <p>14 MR. CHURCHILL: Sure. Could you read</p> <p>15 that back?</p> <p>16 (Last question read back.)</p> <p>17 THE WITNESS: Yes, I did.</p> <p>18 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>19 Q But the topic of the fact that there is a</p> <p>20 lawsuit regarding those payments has never come</p> <p>21 up with Mr. Randall?</p> <p>22 A I'm sorry. Yes, it has.</p> <p>23 Q Okay. And in what way has it come up?</p> <p>24 A Well, with the payments. My -- because then I</p> <p>25 had to pay him \$4,000 a month once I started</p>

Page 17	Page 19
<p>1 getting them.</p> <p>2 Q But if I understand your testimony correctly,</p> <p>3 you're saying that you have not discussed the</p> <p>4 lawsuit -- this lawsuit itself with your</p> <p>5 ex-husband?</p> <p>6 A He vaguely knows what it's about. He does not</p> <p>7 know details. I have not told him details.</p> <p>8 Q Has he discussed at all with you the amount of</p> <p>9 money that you are seeking potentially under the</p> <p>10 damages portion of your lawsuit?</p> <p>11 A No.</p> <p>12 Q Have you discussed that part of your Complaint</p> <p>13 with Justin?</p> <p>14 A Yes.</p> <p>15 Q And what have you discussed with Justin about</p> <p>16 the damages alleged in your Complaint?</p> <p>17 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Again, I will caution</p> <p>18 you not to reveal the contents of discussions that we</p> <p>19 have had.</p> <p>20 MR. CHURCHILL: I just want to know</p> <p>21 what you've talked with Justin about only, not</p> <p>22 anything about what counsel has told you.</p> <p>23 THE WITNESS: Justin pretty much knows</p> <p>24 everything, and he's the one that suggested I get</p> <p>25 some lawyers.</p>	<p>1 Q And the time period that you're talking about</p> <p>2 where he made that suggestion was May of 2020?</p> <p>3 A Before my redemption he wanted me to -- he</p> <p>4 suggested that I get somebody to look at the</p> <p>5 financial records of Widens.</p> <p>6 Q And did Justin make any recommendations with</p> <p>7 respect to getting a lawyer for purposes of this</p> <p>8 lawsuit?</p> <p>9 A Yes.</p> <p>10 Q And when did he make that recommendation if you</p> <p>11 remember?</p> <p>12 A Sometime after -- or before the sale of the</p> <p>13 company.</p> <p>14 Q Was it after you had a conversation with your</p> <p>15 brother Reed about the fact that Widen</p> <p>16 Enterprises was going to be acquired?</p> <p>17 A Yes.</p> <p>18 Q We will get back to some of those details too.</p> <p>19 I'm going to try, if I can, during the course of</p> <p>20 the deposition to somewhat go chronologically</p> <p>21 because I think that will help you --</p> <p>22 potentially help you remember things.</p> <p>23 A Thank you.</p> <p>24 Q Ms. Randall, are you currently employed?</p> <p>25 A No, I am not.</p>
Page 18	Page 20
<p>1 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>2 Q And when you say that specifically, you're</p> <p>3 talking about back in 2021?</p> <p>4 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Form.</p> <p>5 Mischaracterizes her testimony.</p> <p>6 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>7 Q When you say that he suggested that you get</p> <p>8 lawyers, you're talking about back in September</p> <p>9 of 2021?</p> <p>10 A Yeah. I'm talking about May of 2020.</p> <p>11 Q Okay. You're talking about when you were going</p> <p>12 to enter the -- or when you were considering</p> <p>13 entering the redemption agreement back in May of</p> <p>14 2020?</p> <p>15 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Form.</p> <p>16 Mischaracterizes her testimony.</p> <p>17 THE WITNESS: Yes.</p> <p>18 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>19 Q Do you understand my question?</p> <p>20 A Will you repeat?</p> <p>21 Q So you mentioned that Justin was the one that</p> <p>22 recommended you get an attorney?</p> <p>23 A Mm-hmm.</p> <p>24 Q That's a "yes"?</p> <p>25 A Yes.</p>	<p>1 Q And when was the last time that you were</p> <p>2 employed?</p> <p>3 A I was briefly employed in 2000 and part of 2001.</p> <p>4 Q And who was your employer then?</p> <p>5 A Widen Enterprises.</p> <p>6 Q And what were you doing in 2000 and 2001 for</p> <p>7 Widen Enterprises?</p> <p>8 A I was a receptionist.</p> <p>9 Q And was it that one job during that whole time</p> <p>10 2000 to 2001?</p> <p>11 A Yes. I believe my mother passed away in January</p> <p>12 of '01. So I didn't work for very long in '01.</p> <p>13 Q And were you a receptionist at the main company</p> <p>14 location?</p> <p>15 A Yes, I was.</p> <p>16 Q Which is located where?</p> <p>17 A Mangrove Lane.</p> <p>18 Q Other than that job that ended in 2001 as a</p> <p>19 receptionist, have you had any other sources of</p> <p>20 income since that time?</p> <p>21 A No.</p> <p>22 Q Do you have any bank accounts?</p> <p>23 A Yes.</p> <p>24 Q With who?</p> <p>25 A Associated Bank, Summit Credit Union, and Lake</p>

Page 21	Page 23
<p>1 Ridge Bank.</p> <p>2 Q And is Associated Bank your checking account?</p> <p>3 A I have a checking account there, yes.</p> <p>4 Q Any other accounts there?</p> <p>5 A Savings.</p> <p>6 Q Any others?</p> <p>7 A No.</p> <p>8 Q And what is the account that you have at Summit</p> <p>9 Credit Union?</p> <p>10 A I also have a savings and a checking.</p> <p>11 Q And what was the third institution?</p> <p>12 A Lake Ridge.</p> <p>13 Q And what accounts do you have there?</p> <p>14 A Checking and savings.</p> <p>15 Q I have multiple banks too, but I'm interested in</p> <p>16 knowing why you have multiple banks with</p> <p>17 multiple accounts?</p> <p>18 A Because my father always told me, don't put all</p> <p>19 your eggs in one basket.</p> <p>20 Q Any other institutions that you have accounts?</p> <p>21 A Yes.</p> <p>22 Q Okay. What are those?</p> <p>23 A I have an account at Raymond James.</p> <p>24 Q Is that a financial advisor?</p> <p>25 A Yes.</p>	<p>1 which account?</p> <p>2 A Associated checking.</p> <p>3 Q Are you collecting any social security benefits?</p> <p>4 A I'm sorry. Yes, I am.</p> <p>5 Q And where do they go, which account?</p> <p>6 A They go to Lake Ridge checking.</p> <p>7 Q Are you collecting any disability?</p> <p>8 A No.</p> <p>9 Q What about any other sources of money that are</p> <p>10 directly deposited like that?</p> <p>11 A Nothing else. I also do have a Roth.</p> <p>12 Q Okay.</p> <p>13 A That I'm a beneficiary for my son. So my</p> <p>14 husband and I split that.</p> <p>15 Q Explain to me what you mean when you say that</p> <p>16 you're a beneficiary.</p> <p>17 A My husband took his own life. My son took his</p> <p>18 own life, and that was life insurance that he</p> <p>19 had for work and they rolled it.</p> <p>20 Q I see. So it was your son's policy, and you are</p> <p>21 a beneficiary?</p> <p>22 A Correct.</p> <p>23 Q And which account does that one go into?</p> <p>24 A That actually is held at Lake Ridge.</p> <p>25 Q Okay. Any other deposits that you know of or</p>
Page 22	Page 24
<p>1 Q And what type of account is that?</p> <p>2 A I have a savings account. I don't think it's</p> <p>3 called a savings account, but it's pretty much a</p> <p>4 savings account with higher interest, and I have</p> <p>5 a few stocks.</p> <p>6 Q Do you have any certificates of deposit, CDs?</p> <p>7 A No, I do not.</p> <p>8 Q What about a retirement account, do you have one</p> <p>9 of those?</p> <p>10 A I do.</p> <p>11 Q And who is that with?</p> <p>12 A Fidelity.</p> <p>13 Q How many retirement accounts do you have?</p> <p>14 A Just that one.</p> <p>15 Q And do you know what form of a retirement</p> <p>16 account that is, for example is it a Roth IRA?</p> <p>17 A No. I know it's not that.</p> <p>18 Q Do you have a 401K?</p> <p>19 A No.</p> <p>20 Q What, if any, direct deposits do you have to any</p> <p>21 of your accounts, and what I mean by that is</p> <p>22 money that is automatically deposited from some</p> <p>23 source?</p> <p>24 A Just the payment for my stocks.</p> <p>25 Q And the payment from your stocks goes where, to</p>	<p>1 can think of?</p> <p>2 A No.</p> <p>3 Q What about from your dad's estate, is there</p> <p>4 money that is still being distributed from your</p> <p>5 father's estate to you?</p> <p>6 A No.</p> <p>7 Q I wanted to ask you a little bit more about the</p> <p>8 stocks that you mentioned having at Raymond</p> <p>9 James. Do you know what companies you are</p> <p>10 invested in?</p> <p>11 A I cannot recall.</p> <p>12 Q Do you know the size of the portfolio?</p> <p>13 A 63,000.</p> <p>14 Q And that's as of your last check?</p> <p>15 A Correct.</p> <p>16 Q Have you sold stock -- I'm sorry, go ahead.</p> <p>17 A No check. There's no -- I didn't get a check</p> <p>18 for that.</p> <p>19 Q Understood.</p> <p>20 A Okay.</p> <p>21 Q That's money that's currently invested, correct?</p> <p>22 A Correct.</p> <p>23 Q Have you sold stocks recently?</p> <p>24 A Not since May of 2020.</p> <p>25 Q And none from your portfolio with Raymond James?</p>

Page 25	Page 27
<p>1 A No.</p> <p>2 Q Ms. Randall, do you currently serve on any</p> <p>3 boards of directors?</p> <p>4 A No.</p> <p>5 Q Do you currently hold any positions with any</p> <p>6 associations?</p> <p>7 A No, I do not.</p> <p>8 Q Are there any groups that you belong to?</p> <p>9 A No.</p> <p>10 Q For example, are you on a church group or</p> <p>11 anything like that?</p> <p>12 A No, I am not.</p> <p>13 Q Is there any other source of income that you</p> <p>14 currently have that we have not discussed?</p> <p>15 A No, there is not.</p> <p>16 Q I want to talk a little bit about the document</p> <p>17 collection process. We will be going over some</p> <p>18 documents today and some of them are yours and</p> <p>19 some are mine. I want to get a sense for where</p> <p>20 your documents are in terms of your -- what you</p> <p>21 have provided your counsel and what we may have</p> <p>22 missed or not.</p> <p>23 When you first were going to file this</p> <p>24 lawsuit, did you collect any documents for your</p> <p>25 counsel?</p>	<p>1 A I don't even know what that is, so, no.</p> <p>2 Q Is the only message platform that you use your</p> <p>3 iMessage platform?</p> <p>4 A Yes.</p> <p>5 Q What email accounts do you have, Ms. Randall?</p> <p>6 A I have one account.</p> <p>7 Q And which one is that?</p> <p>8 A StacyleeRandall6@gmail.com.</p> <p>9 Q Have you had prior email accounts in the past?</p> <p>10 A Yes.</p> <p>11 Q Which ones?</p> <p>12 A Oh, Lord. It's been so long. I have had this</p> <p>13 email for a long time. So I believe my first</p> <p>14 email was SLR -- SLR13@yahoo.</p> <p>15 Q And when is the last time you used that account?</p> <p>16 A That was my very first account. So that was a</p> <p>17 long, long time ago.</p> <p>18 Q Can you estimate how long ago?</p> <p>19 A I didn't jump on the email train right away. I</p> <p>20 can't. I'm sorry.</p> <p>21 Q That's okay. Do you think you have used that</p> <p>22 Yahoo account within the last ten years?</p> <p>23 A No.</p> <p>24 Q Within the last 20 years, so that would be 2003?</p> <p>25 A No.</p>
Page 26	Page 28
<p>1 A No.</p> <p>2 Q In the course of this lawsuit, and by that I'm</p> <p>3 going to mean -- when I say "this lawsuit," I'm</p> <p>4 going to basically mean from filing in September</p> <p>5 of 2021 until now; is that okay?</p> <p>6 A Yes.</p> <p>7 Q Have you handed documents to your counsel?</p> <p>8 A Not that I can remember.</p> <p>9 Q Have you ever been asked to search for</p> <p>10 documents?</p> <p>11 A Not that I can recall.</p> <p>12 Q Have you ever searched your phone for documents</p> <p>13 or, for example, messages?</p> <p>14 A No, I have not.</p> <p>15 Q So did you at any point turn your phone over to</p> <p>16 have it searched?</p> <p>17 A Yes, I did.</p> <p>18 Q And with respect to what would have been on your</p> <p>19 phone or what is on your phone, do you use your</p> <p>20 message feature?</p> <p>21 A Yes.</p> <p>22 Q And is it an iPhone?</p> <p>23 A Yes.</p> <p>24 Q Do you have any other message platforms that you</p> <p>25 use like WhatsApp?</p>	<p>1 Q Do you think you ever used that account, the</p> <p>2 SLR13yahoo account while you were working at</p> <p>3 Widen?</p> <p>4 A No.</p> <p>5 Q When you were working at Widen, the last time</p> <p>6 being 2000 to 2001, did you use your personal</p> <p>7 email?</p> <p>8 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Form.</p> <p>9 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>10 Q For work purposes?</p> <p>11 A No.</p> <p>12 Q I assumed you used your personal email for</p> <p>13 personal purposes?</p> <p>14 A Yes.</p> <p>15 Q And you had a Widen email account while working</p> <p>16 at Widen?</p> <p>17 A No, I did not.</p> <p>18 Q You never had a Widen email account?</p> <p>19 A No.</p> <p>20 Q So did you ever send emails while working at</p> <p>21 Widen related to Widen business?</p> <p>22 A No, I did not.</p> <p>23 Q When you were working as a receptionist no one</p> <p>24 emailed you?</p> <p>25 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Form.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 29</p> <p>1 Mischaracterizes her testimony.</p> <p>2 THE WITNESS: What do you mean by "no</p> <p>3 one"?</p> <p>4 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>5 Q Back when you were working as a receptionist in</p> <p>6 2000 to 2001 no one emailed you at work for work</p> <p>7 purposes?</p> <p>8 A No.</p> <p>9 Q How did people communicate with you, just by</p> <p>10 phone and in person?</p> <p>11 A Correct.</p> <p>12 Q When you were working at Widen in 2000 and 2001,</p> <p>13 did anybody text you for work purposes?</p> <p>14 A No.</p> <p>15 Q In this case there have been some -- and when I</p> <p>16 say "this case," I mean this litigation which</p> <p>17 started in 2022 and, again, you have the</p> <p>18 Complaint?</p> <p>19 A Correct.</p> <p>20 Q So the -- for your orientation purposes, the</p> <p>21 filing date is actually listed at the top, so</p> <p>22 July 21, 2022, is when you filed your Complaint.</p> <p>23 There have been document requests that have been</p> <p>24 served upon you. Are you familiar with that</p> <p>25 process at all?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 31</p> <p>1 Q So you -- I may have already asked you this</p> <p>2 question, but now that you have the benefit of</p> <p>3 this document if you will permit me to ask you</p> <p>4 again, do you remember looking for documents in</p> <p>5 response to requests for documents?</p> <p>6 A Yes, I do.</p> <p>7 Q And did you provide documents to counsel?</p> <p>8 A Yes, I did.</p> <p>9 Q Did you search your -- your files at home, if</p> <p>10 you have files, for any hard copy documents that</p> <p>11 you might have?</p> <p>12 A No, I did not.</p> <p>13 Q Do you keep hard copy files?</p> <p>14 A No, I do not.</p> <p>15 Q What about audio or audiovisual files, do you</p> <p>16 have anything like that that could relate to</p> <p>17 this lawsuit?</p> <p>18 A No.</p> <p>19 Q For example, do you have any recordings of voice</p> <p>20 messages that have been left for you by, for</p> <p>21 example, your brother?</p> <p>22 A No.</p> <p>23 Q Have you ever in interacting with the defendants</p> <p>24 in this case used an audio recorder to record</p> <p>25 what somebody was saying?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 30</p> <p>1 A That have been served upon me? Can you explain</p> <p>2 what you mean?</p> <p>3 MS. POLAKOWSKI: And, Stacy, again to</p> <p>4 the extent that you would need to disclose contents</p> <p>5 of conversations you have had with us to answer these</p> <p>6 questions, I will caution you not to do so.</p> <p>7 (Exhibit No. 3 was marked.)</p> <p>8 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>9 Q So the court reporter has handed you what's been</p> <p>10 marked for identification as Exhibit 3 to your</p> <p>11 deposition.</p> <p>12 A Okay.</p> <p>13 Q And I will just identify it for record. It's a</p> <p>14 document titled, Plaintiff Stacy L. Randall's</p> <p>15 Objections and Responses to Defendant's First</p> <p>16 Requests for Production of Documents. Do you</p> <p>17 see that?</p> <p>18 A Yes.</p> <p>19 Q I just mentioned document requests when I was</p> <p>20 asking you a question. I will represent to you</p> <p>21 that this document is actually the responses</p> <p>22 that your counsel provided to our request. Have</p> <p>23 you seen this document before?</p> <p>24 A No. I don't -- I can't recall. I remember</p> <p>25 answering questions.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 32</p> <p>1 A No.</p> <p>2 Q When you were meeting with -- I'm jumping ahead</p> <p>3 a little bit, so you let me know if I need to</p> <p>4 establish a background. When you were meeting</p> <p>5 with Mr. Kiesler related to the May redemption,</p> <p>6 did you record any of that meeting?</p> <p>7 A No.</p> <p>8 Q When you were talking with your brother on the</p> <p>9 phone in May of 2020, did you record that?</p> <p>10 A No.</p> <p>11 Q Did you search for any recordings in response to</p> <p>12 the document request in this case?</p> <p>13 A No.</p> <p>14 Q But you're confident that you don't have any?</p> <p>15 A Yes.</p> <p>16 Q You can set that exhibit to the side. It does</p> <p>17 make sense during the course of the day to keep</p> <p>18 the Complaint handy because I think that will be</p> <p>19 helpful, and I'm going to be referring to it off</p> <p>20 and on. For the most part the other exhibits</p> <p>21 you can push off to the side.</p> <p>22 A Okay.</p> <p>23 Q Are you aware of any documents that you have</p> <p>24 related to this case that you have not provided</p> <p>25 to your attorneys?</p>

Page 33	Page 35
<p>1 A No.</p> <p>2 Q Are you aware of any electronic files that</p> <p>3 relate to this case that you have not provided</p> <p>4 to your attorneys?</p> <p>5 A No.</p> <p>6 Q The reason why I mentioned September 20 of 2021</p> <p>7 earlier was that that was a day that your</p> <p>8 attorneys, Reinhart firm, sent something called</p> <p>9 a Litigation Hold Notice to what now are the</p> <p>10 defendants in this case. Do you remember that</p> <p>11 process?</p> <p>12 A No. Not specifically.</p> <p>13 Q So I will have some documents that I can show</p> <p>14 you that will help remind you a little bit.</p> <p>15 Generally stating your attorneys sent</p> <p>16 some letters telling your brother, for example,</p> <p>17 as one of them to preserve documents because you</p> <p>18 had some concerns about the redemption -- about</p> <p>19 the redemption. Do you remember that?</p> <p>20 A I remember them telling me that, yes.</p> <p>21 Q And, in fact, you reached out to your brother to</p> <p>22 let him know that, you were giving him a heads</p> <p>23 up to let him know that this was coming?</p> <p>24 A I did.</p> <p>25 Q Since that time period, that September time</p>	<p>1 Q Okay. You're going to have to do the math for</p> <p>2 me. How old were you in 1977?</p> <p>3 A 1977, I was born in '57, so 20 years.</p> <p>4 Q Okay. So you were 20. And what were you doing</p> <p>5 in 1977 for the company?</p> <p>6 A I was working in the dark room as a contact</p> <p>7 person.</p> <p>8 Q What does that mean?</p> <p>9 A At the time we were prepress and every page has</p> <p>10 four colors, and the strippers were the ones</p> <p>11 that made up the pages, like for a catalog, and</p> <p>12 they made yellow, red, blue, and black. And I</p> <p>13 would have to combine different things that they</p> <p>14 had and put it on film.</p> <p>15 Q So you were actually touching and working in the</p> <p>16 process?</p> <p>17 A Yes.</p> <p>18 Q And how long did you do that particular job?</p> <p>19 A I did that until '86.</p> <p>20 Q And from 1977 to '86 were you pretty much doing</p> <p>21 that same job the whole time?</p> <p>22 A Yes.</p> <p>23 Q Were you paid?</p> <p>24 A Yes.</p> <p>25 Q Do you remember how much?</p>
Page 34	Page 36
<p>1 period, have you deleted any documents that are</p> <p>2 relevant for this case?</p> <p>3 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Object to form.</p> <p>4 Calls for a legal conclusion as to relevance.</p> <p>5 THE WITNESS: Can you rephrase?</p> <p>6 MR. CHURCHILL: Sure. Can you read</p> <p>7 back the question?</p> <p>8 (Last question read back.)</p> <p>9 THE WITNESS: No.</p> <p>10 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>11 Q Are there any files that you have destroyed or</p> <p>12 gotten rid of that are relevant to this case?</p> <p>13 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Same objection.</p> <p>14 THE WITNESS: No.</p> <p>15 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>16 Q I want to go back a little bit to your history</p> <p>17 of working with the company and how you kind of</p> <p>18 proceeded along the way. So we're going to</p> <p>19 start way back in time.</p> <p>20 You are obviously part of the Widen</p> <p>21 family, correct?</p> <p>22 A Yes.</p> <p>23 Q And do you have a recollection of when you first</p> <p>24 got involved in any way with the company?</p> <p>25 A It was in 19 -- wait. I believe it was in 1977.</p>	<p>1 A No.</p> <p>2 Q Did you have shares in Widen at the time?</p> <p>3 A Yes.</p> <p>4 Q Do you remember how much?</p> <p>5 A 20 percent.</p> <p>6 Q And you grew up with four brothers, correct?</p> <p>7 A Yes, I did.</p> <p>8 Q And can you give me the birth order?</p> <p>9 A Stewart, Reed, Tyler, and Price.</p> <p>10 Q And where are you?</p> <p>11 A I'm at the top.</p> <p>12 Q You're first?</p> <p>13 A I am first.</p> <p>14 Q Okay. What other jobs did you hold with the</p> <p>15 Widen company?</p> <p>16 A Other than the receptionist, nothing.</p> <p>17 Q And so that first job ended in 1986?</p> <p>18 A Correct.</p> <p>19 Q And were you terminated from that position?</p> <p>20 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for</p> <p>21 a legal conclusion.</p> <p>22 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>23 Q Do you understand my question?</p> <p>24 A Yes, I do. I was terminated sometime, but I</p> <p>25 don't believe it was in '86.</p>

Page 37	Page 39
<p>1 Q What do you recall about the termination?</p> <p>2 A That I and my husband were both called to the</p> <p>3 front office and three of my brothers and my dad</p> <p>4 were there.</p> <p>5 Q Which brothers?</p> <p>6 A Tyler -- Stewart, Reed, and Tyler.</p> <p>7 Q Okay. And what happened?</p> <p>8 A They told me I was a distraction and that it</p> <p>9 would be best if I left.</p> <p>10 Q Do you remember anything else that was said?</p> <p>11 A I don't remember.</p> <p>12 Q You weren't certain that this was in 1986. Why?</p> <p>13 A Well, because after my youngest went to</p> <p>14 kindergarten I went back like part time, and I</p> <p>15 think it was during that time after I went back</p> <p>16 when she started going to kindergarten, so that</p> <p>17 would be '90, '91. That is when it was.</p> <p>18 Q Why was Steven called, if you know, to be a part</p> <p>19 of that meeting?</p> <p>20 A I'm not sure.</p> <p>21 Q Was he working for the company as well?</p> <p>22 A Yes.</p> <p>23 Q What was he doing?</p> <p>24 A I believe at that time he was -- he was a</p> <p>25 stripper.</p>	<p>1 that they want me gone, then I'm going to leave.</p> <p>2 Q I take it you disagreed with their</p> <p>3 characterization of you?</p> <p>4 A I did.</p> <p>5 Q Do you have any idea what they were referring</p> <p>6 to?</p> <p>7 A No, I do not.</p> <p>8 Q Have you ever talked about it with anyone since</p> <p>9 this time?</p> <p>10 A No.</p> <p>11 Q Did you talk about it with your then husband</p> <p>12 Steven?</p> <p>13 A Well, he was there so he knew. So I don't</p> <p>14 remember.</p> <p>15 Q Did that determination to terminate you have any</p> <p>16 impact on your shares with either company at the</p> <p>17 time?</p> <p>18 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Object to the extent</p> <p>19 it calls for a legal conclusion. Calls for</p> <p>20 speculation.</p> <p>21 THE WITNESS: I'm not sure.</p> <p>22 MR. CHURCHILL: So let's try to get</p> <p>23 some -- ahold around the time period.</p> <p>24 (Exhibit No. 4 was marked.)</p> <p>25 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p>
Page 38	Page 40
<p>1 Q Who -- if there was a single person, who made</p> <p>2 the determination to terminate you in that</p> <p>3 period '90 to '91?</p> <p>4 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for</p> <p>5 speculation.</p> <p>6 THE WITNESS: I don't know.</p> <p>7 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>8 Q Do you remember who said, Stacy, you're being a</p> <p>9 distraction or something to that effect?</p> <p>10 A There was -- it was either Reed or Tyler.</p> <p>11 Q Do you remember who was in charge or running the</p> <p>12 company at that time?</p> <p>13 A My father.</p> <p>14 Q Did you say anything to your father about the</p> <p>15 decision?</p> <p>16 A I did not.</p> <p>17 Q Did you fight it?</p> <p>18 A No.</p> <p>19 Q Did you ever have any discussions with your</p> <p>20 brothers or your father about that decision to</p> <p>21 terminate?</p> <p>22 A No.</p> <p>23 Q Why not?</p> <p>24 A They are pretty scary people especially when</p> <p>25 they are all in one room. So I just decided</p>	<p>1 Q Okay. Ms. Randall, the court reporter has</p> <p>2 handed you what's been marked for identification</p> <p>3 as Exhibit 4 to your deposition.</p> <p>4 A Mm-hmm.</p> <p>5 Q And the document is not Bates labeled, but this</p> <p>6 is a document that has been -- or is your</p> <p>7 version Bates labeled? Good. Okay. My version</p> <p>8 is not Bates labeled.</p> <p>9 This is a document that's been produced</p> <p>10 in the case. Do you recognize this document,</p> <p>11 Shareholder Agreement of Widen Colourgraphics,</p> <p>12 LTD?</p> <p>13 A No.</p> <p>14 Q Are you aware that there is a shareholder</p> <p>15 agreement?</p> <p>16 A Yes.</p> <p>17 Q If you would -- and I don't have the benefit of</p> <p>18 the Bates number. The Bates number, when I say</p> <p>19 that, that's going to be numbers in the bottom</p> <p>20 right corner. For the most part today I'm going</p> <p>21 to use that as a guide to track with you where</p> <p>22 we are talking. For purposes of this document</p> <p>23 I'm going to use the actual page number on the</p> <p>24 document. Would you flip to page 18?</p> <p>25 A Okay.</p>

Page 41	Page 43
<p>1 Q And do you see your signature there,</p> <p>2 Ms. Randall?</p> <p>3 A Yes.</p> <p>4 Q And you -- as I read it, it says, "Stacy Widen</p> <p>5 Randall," and you wrote above it "Stacy Widen</p> <p>6 Randall." Do you see that?</p> <p>7 A Yes, I do.</p> <p>8 Q And is that to the best of your knowledge your</p> <p>9 signature?</p> <p>10 A Yes, it is.</p> <p>11 Q You don't have a recollection of signing this</p> <p>12 document specifically?</p> <p>13 A When my dad wanted us to sign something, we</p> <p>14 signed. And I probably just saw this paper.</p> <p>15 Q Why do you say that?</p> <p>16 A Because that's just the way he operated.</p> <p>17 Q So do you believe that you didn't actually</p> <p>18 review the 1992 shareholder agreement before you</p> <p>19 signed it?</p> <p>20 A I did not review it.</p> <p>21 Q You know that for certain?</p> <p>22 A Yes.</p> <p>23 Q Were you concerned that you weren't reviewing a</p> <p>24 document before signing it?</p> <p>25 A Like I said, if my dad told me to do something,</p>	<p>1 A No.</p> <p>2 Q Why?</p> <p>3 A I just never thought about it.</p> <p>4 Q Do you know in what capacity you were signing</p> <p>5 this particular document? As you look at it do</p> <p>6 you know what capacity you were signing?</p> <p>7 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection to the</p> <p>8 extent that it calls for a legal conclusion.</p> <p>9 THE WITNESS: Capacity, what do you</p> <p>10 mean by "capacity"?</p> <p>11 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>12 Q Sure. So for example, on page 18 your dad is</p> <p>13 Mark Widen -- was Mark Widen, correct?</p> <p>14 A Mm-hmm.</p> <p>15 Q So he was signing as president, do you see that?</p> <p>16 A Yes.</p> <p>17 Q Do you know why your signature line is there?</p> <p>18 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for</p> <p>19 speculation.</p> <p>20 THE WITNESS: Somebody put it there.</p> <p>21 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>22 Q Well, you were a shareholder, right?</p> <p>23 A Yes.</p> <p>24 Q So do you think that was why you were signing?</p> <p>25 A I can't say.</p>
Page 42	Page 44
<p>1 like sign here, I did.</p> <p>2 Q And do you have a specific memory of your dad</p> <p>3 telling you that in this instance?</p> <p>4 A No.</p> <p>5 Q So you are assuming that's what happened or</p> <p>6 you're not sure?</p> <p>7 A There were many things that I had to sign. So I</p> <p>8 don't specifically remember this time.</p> <p>9 Q So is there a chance that you actually did</p> <p>10 review the 1992 shareholder agreement before</p> <p>11 signing it?</p> <p>12 A No.</p> <p>13 Q Why do you say that?</p> <p>14 A Because I probably wasn't given it. I was not</p> <p>15 given it.</p> <p>16 Q Was it important for you at the time to review a</p> <p>17 document before signing it?</p> <p>18 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Object to form.</p> <p>19 THE WITNESS: Can you rephrase that,</p> <p>20 please?</p> <p>21 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>22 Q Sure. Let me back up a little bit. Did it</p> <p>23 concern you if you were given a document by your</p> <p>24 father that you weren't reviewing it before</p> <p>25 signing it?</p>	<p>1 Q Would you flip the page -- actually, you don't</p> <p>2 need to flip. You got it right there. I have</p> <p>3 to flip. So the page titled Exhibit A, schedule</p> <p>4 of shareholders. Do you see that?</p> <p>5 A Yes.</p> <p>6 Q And your name is listed first under name, right,</p> <p>7 "Stacy Widen Randall." Do you see that?</p> <p>8 A Yes.</p> <p>9 Q And then in the second column it's titled "Class</p> <p>10 A Common Stock." Do you see that?</p> <p>11 A Yes.</p> <p>12 Q And then there's a number underneath, 4,655. Do</p> <p>13 you see that?</p> <p>14 A Yes.</p> <p>15 Q And then there's a third column, "Class B Common</p> <p>16 Stock." Do you see that?</p> <p>17 A Yes.</p> <p>18 Q And then there's a number underneath listed</p> <p>19 56,790. Do you also see that?</p> <p>20 A Yes.</p> <p>21 Q In addition to your name here, there are four</p> <p>22 additional people listed. Do you see that?</p> <p>23 A Yes.</p> <p>24 Q Your brothers Reed, right?</p> <p>25 A Yes.</p>

Page 45	Page 47
<p>1 Q Stewart, right?</p> <p>2 A Yes.</p> <p>3 Q Tyler, correct?</p> <p>4 A Yes.</p> <p>5 Q And Price, correct?</p> <p>6 A Yes.</p> <p>7 Q Is it your understanding that this Exhibit A</p> <p>8 schedule of shareholders was the listing of</p> <p>9 stock provided to you and all of your brothers</p> <p>10 under the 1992 shareholder agreement?</p> <p>11 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Object to the extent</p> <p>12 that it calls for a legal conclusion.</p> <p>13 THE WITNESS: I don't know that.</p> <p>14 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>15 Q Do you recall whether or not as of 1992 this</p> <p>16 division of shares was the actual amount of</p> <p>17 shares that you held in the company then known</p> <p>18 as Widen Colourgraphics?</p> <p>19 A I had no way of knowing.</p> <p>20 Q You didn't know how many shares you possessed at</p> <p>21 the time?</p> <p>22 A That's right.</p> <p>23 Q Did you think it was important for you to know</p> <p>24 how many shares you held?</p> <p>25 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Object to form.</p>	<p>1 something, would you have said something to your</p> <p>2 father?</p> <p>3 A No.</p> <p>4 Q Would you have said something to one of your</p> <p>5 brothers?</p> <p>6 A No.</p> <p>7 Q Did you ever have a concern -- let's go back to</p> <p>8 this time frame, the 1992 time frame. Did you</p> <p>9 have a concern that you were signing something</p> <p>10 that somehow you shouldn't be signing or didn't</p> <p>11 want to sign?</p> <p>12 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Object to form.</p> <p>13 THE WITNESS: Well, like I said</p> <p>14 before, I never questioned my dad.</p> <p>15 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>16 Q But as to my question specifically, did you have</p> <p>17 a concern that you were signing something?</p> <p>18 A No.</p> <p>19 Q You weren't concerned that your dad was somehow</p> <p>20 treating you unfairly?</p> <p>21 A No.</p> <p>22 Q Were you concerned in 1992 that one of your</p> <p>23 brothers was treating you unfairly?</p> <p>24 A No.</p> <p>25 Q Did you have an attorney help you at all with</p>
Page 46	Page 48
<p>1 THE WITNESS: I probably never thought</p> <p>2 about it or I never thought about it.</p> <p>3 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>4 Q You never thought about what exactly?</p> <p>5 A What you just asked me.</p> <p>6 Q You never thought about how many shares you</p> <p>7 held?</p> <p>8 A Yes.</p> <p>9 Q Why not?</p> <p>10 A And whether it was important. I knew I had 20</p> <p>11 percent.</p> <p>12 Q Okay.</p> <p>13 A That's all I knew.</p> <p>14 Q And if you go back to that page 18 that we were</p> <p>15 looking at before, you see that the other</p> <p>16 persons that signed in addition to your dad were</p> <p>17 your brothers, correct?</p> <p>18 A Yes.</p> <p>19 Q Do you now have a better recollection as to why</p> <p>20 you signed the 1992 shareholder agreement?</p> <p>21 A Now I do, yes.</p> <p>22 Q Okay. And is it your understanding that you</p> <p>23 were signing as a shareholder of the company?</p> <p>24 A As of right now I do.</p> <p>25 Q If you had an issue or a concern about signing</p>	<p>1 respect to this 1992 shareholder agreement at</p> <p>2 the time?</p> <p>3 A No.</p> <p>4 Q If you recall, when was the first time you ever</p> <p>5 engaged an attorney for anything?</p> <p>6 A Right now. This. I'm sorry, my divorce.</p> <p>7 Q You never engaged an attorney prior to that?</p> <p>8 A Never.</p> <p>9 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Mark, we have been</p> <p>10 going about an hour. Whenever you're at a good spot,</p> <p>11 can we just take a short break?</p> <p>12 MR. CHURCHILL: We can take one now.</p> <p>13 That's fine. We're going to come back to this</p> <p>14 document. So you can leave that there, but now is a</p> <p>15 good time for a break.</p> <p>16 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Off the record</p> <p>17 10:18 a.m.</p> <p>18 (Brief recess taken.)</p> <p>19 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the</p> <p>20 record at 10:36 a.m.</p> <p>21 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>22 Q So, Ms. Randall, we were still working with that</p> <p>23 Exhibit 4, the 1992 shareholder agreement. Do</p> <p>24 you recall whether or not any of your brothers</p> <p>25 had an attorney representing them for purposes</p>

Page 49	Page 51
<p>1 of signing the 1992 shareholder agreement?</p> <p>2 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection.</p> <p>3 Foundation.</p> <p>4 THE WITNESS: I don't know.</p> <p>5 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>6 Q Do you recall at all the actual signing?</p> <p>7 A Of this particular document?</p> <p>8 Q Yes.</p> <p>9 A No.</p> <p>10 Q Do you recall if at the time Widen</p> <p>11 Colourgraphics had an attorney that it used for</p> <p>12 documents like this?</p> <p>13 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection.</p> <p>14 Foundation.</p> <p>15 THE WITNESS: I would have no idea.</p> <p>16 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>17 Q Do you have a memory of any attorney that the</p> <p>18 Widen company used at any point in time?</p> <p>19 A The only one I knew of was Scott Seid.</p> <p>20 Q With the Stafford Rosenbaum firm?</p> <p>21 A Yes.</p> <p>22 Q You don't remember any attorney prior to Scott</p> <p>23 Seid?</p> <p>24 A My dad, when my dad was around he used a guy by</p> <p>25 the name -- last name was Kilkelly.</p>	<p>1 the 1992 shareholder agreement when you signed</p> <p>2 it?</p> <p>3 A I didn't know what I was signing.</p> <p>4 Q Tell me a little bit more about your dad and how</p> <p>5 he was mean and intimidating. Can you give me a</p> <p>6 little more explanation on that?</p> <p>7 A You met my brother Reed, very similar, had no</p> <p>8 patience, no tolerance, didn't want to talk</p> <p>9 about the weather, business, and he was a jerk.</p> <p>10 He was physically and mentally abusive.</p> <p>11 Q Was he physically abusive to you?</p> <p>12 A No.</p> <p>13 Q Was he mentally abusive to you?</p> <p>14 A Yes.</p> <p>15 Q In what way?</p> <p>16 A He was just mean and putting me down all the</p> <p>17 time. The one thing that sticks in my mind the</p> <p>18 most was I was walking through the living room</p> <p>19 into their sun room, and it was a big room. So</p> <p>20 he watched me walk for quite a while, and he</p> <p>21 looked at me and said, "I thought you said you</p> <p>22 were trying to lose weight, not gain it."</p> <p>23 Constant things like that.</p> <p>24 Q And this is your dad saying that about when, do</p> <p>25 you remember? Like what year or how old were</p>
Page 50	Page 52
<p>1 Q Did you ever meet Mr. Kilkelly?</p> <p>2 A I'm not sure.</p> <p>3 Q Do you remember whether or not you ever</p> <p>4 communicated with Mr. Kilkelly yourself?</p> <p>5 A No.</p> <p>6 Q You don't remember?</p> <p>7 A No, I did not communicate.</p> <p>8 Q So did you ever ask Mr. Kilkelly for any legal</p> <p>9 help?</p> <p>10 A No.</p> <p>11 Q Did you ever reach out to an attorney to the</p> <p>12 best of your knowledge with respect to the 1992</p> <p>13 shareholder agreement?</p> <p>14 A No.</p> <p>15 Q Do you recall whether you considered speaking</p> <p>16 with an attorney about the 1992 shareholder</p> <p>17 agreement?</p> <p>18 A I did not consider it.</p> <p>19 Q Can you tell me why you didn't consider it, if</p> <p>20 you remember?</p> <p>21 A Like I said, my dad was a very intimidating,</p> <p>22 mean person and if he told me to sign something</p> <p>23 I signed it. No questions asked.</p> <p>24 Q But, again, you weren't concerned to the best of</p> <p>25 your recollection that something was wrong with</p>	<p>1 you?</p> <p>2 A I don't know how old I was. I was married. I</p> <p>3 can tell you that.</p> <p>4 Q Any other ways that he was mentally abusive to</p> <p>5 you?</p> <p>6 A Every day.</p> <p>7 Q Did you interact with him every day?</p> <p>8 A Well, every day that I spoke with him, and I</p> <p>9 honestly tried not to interact with him.</p> <p>10 Q Your dad died in 2003; is that correct?</p> <p>11 A I thought '02, but I don't know.</p> <p>12 Q How was your relationship with your father at</p> <p>13 the time that he passed, in and around that</p> <p>14 time?</p> <p>15 A It was civil.</p> <p>16 Q You're not sure in 1992 whether you were still</p> <p>17 working for the company at the time, right? If</p> <p>18 I remember your testimony from earlier you may</p> <p>19 have been terminated in '91?</p> <p>20 A I may have been.</p> <p>21 Q What do you recall, Ms. Randall, about the</p> <p>22 evolution of the business? You were talking</p> <p>23 before about the prepress business. Did the</p> <p>24 company change the business that it was in?</p> <p>25 A Yes.</p>

Page 53	Page 55
<p>1 Q What do you recall about that?</p> <p>2 A I recall Reed appointing Matthew Gonnering as</p> <p>3 CEO and then all of a sudden things changed.</p> <p>4 Q How so?</p> <p>5 A I was not working there. I never talked about</p> <p>6 it with anybody. So I know that they did</p> <p>7 software of some kind.</p> <p>8 Q Do you remember what the business line was like</p> <p>9 when you were working as a receptionist in 2000</p> <p>10 to 2001, was it still prepress then?</p> <p>11 A Yes.</p> <p>12 Q Do you have any recollection of the creation of</p> <p>13 Windy Waters as an entity?</p> <p>14 A I do not.</p> <p>15 Q Did you at some point come to understand that</p> <p>16 Windy Waters was what's known as a holding</p> <p>17 company?</p> <p>18 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Object to the extent</p> <p>19 it calls for a legal conclusion.</p> <p>20 THE WITNESS: I don't know what a</p> <p>21 holding company is. So I would have to say no.</p> <p>22 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>23 Q You did know that you essentially traded in your</p> <p>24 stock in the Widen company for stock in Windy</p> <p>25 Waters, correct?</p>	<p>1 Exhibit 5, Ms. Randall, is a document titled</p> <p>2 "Amendment of Shareholder Agreement of Widen</p> <p>3 Colourgraphics, Limited." Do you see that at</p> <p>4 the top?</p> <p>5 A Yes, I do.</p> <p>6 Q And the date indicated there in that first</p> <p>7 sentence is an effective date of September 12th,</p> <p>8 2001. Do you see that as well?</p> <p>9 A I do.</p> <p>10 Q And if you flip to the second page of Exhibit 5,</p> <p>11 Ms. Randall, do you see your signature?</p> <p>12 A Yes, I do.</p> <p>13 Q And it states, "Stacy Widen Randall," correct?</p> <p>14 A Yes.</p> <p>15 Q And similar to the 1992 shareholder agreement</p> <p>16 that we were just looking at, your dad is listed</p> <p>17 there as the president, correct?</p> <p>18 A Yes.</p> <p>19 Q And then your four brothers also each signed,</p> <p>20 correct?</p> <p>21 A Yes.</p> <p>22 Q If you flip back to the first page, Ms. Randall,</p> <p>23 there is a portion of the document titled</p> <p>24 "Recitals." Do you see that up at the top?</p> <p>25 A Yes.</p>
Page 54	Page 56
<p>1 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Form to</p> <p>2 the extent it calls for a legal conclusion.</p> <p>3 THE WITNESS: I did not -- I'm not</p> <p>4 aware of that.</p> <p>5 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>6 Q You know that the stock that you ultimately</p> <p>7 redeemed in May 2020 was Windy Waters stock,</p> <p>8 though, correct?</p> <p>9 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Same objection.</p> <p>10 THE WITNESS: No.</p> <p>11 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>12 Q Did you believe you had Widen Enterprises stock?</p> <p>13 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection.</p> <p>14 Mischaracterizes her testimony.</p> <p>15 THE WITNESS: Yes.</p> <p>16 (Exhibit No. 5 was marked.)</p> <p>17 THE WITNESS: Are we done with Exhibit</p> <p>18 4?</p> <p>19 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>20 Q Who knows if we come back to it, but you can put</p> <p>21 it to the side for now. I can't promise you,</p> <p>22 Ms. Randall.</p> <p>23 You have been handed what's been marked</p> <p>24 for identification as Exhibit 5 to your</p> <p>25 deposition. Take a moment to look at it.</p>	<p>1 Q And I'm going to orient you a little bit to the</p> <p>2 document by reading through a couple things, and</p> <p>3 then I will get to a question here.</p> <p>4 Under the first recital it says, "The</p> <p>5 undersigned (collectively shareholders,</p> <p>6 individually shareholder) entered into that</p> <p>7 certain shareholder agreement of Widen</p> <p>8 Colourgraphics, Limited, as of March 1, 1992,"</p> <p>9 and then it defines it as Widen shareholder</p> <p>10 agreement. Do you see that?</p> <p>11 A Yes.</p> <p>12 Q And then in paragraph 2, "The shareholders,</p> <p>13 except for Tyler Widen, exchanged all the shares</p> <p>14 of stock they held in Widen Colourgraphics,</p> <p>15 Limited, NKA" -- which means now known as --</p> <p>16 "Widen Enterprises, Inc., for sales of Windy</p> <p>17 Waters, Inc." Do you see that?</p> <p>18 A Yes.</p> <p>19 Q Paragraph 3, "Tyler Widen sold his shares in</p> <p>20 Widen Colourgraphics, Limited, to the</p> <p>21 shareholders pursuant to a shareholder agreement</p> <p>22 dated January 1, 1995." Do you see that?</p> <p>23 A Yes.</p> <p>24 Q And then paragraph 4, "Subsequently Tyler Widen</p> <p>25 and the shareholders received additional shares</p>

Page 57	Page 59
<p>1 of Windy Waters, Inc., by virtue of a 2 distribution from grantor retained annuity 3 trusts of Mark Widen and Betty Widen." Do you 4 see that? 5 A Yes. 6 Q Is Betty Widen your mother? 7 A Yes. 8 Q And then paragraph 5, "The shareholders desire 9 to amend the Widen shareholder agreement to have 10 it apply to their shares of Windy Waters, Inc." 11 Do you see that? 12 A I do. 13 Q Do you have a recollection of signing this 14 amendment September 12th, 2001? 15 A I can't recall. 16 Q Does this document at all help you recall that 17 your shares were now in Windy Waters, Inc.? 18 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Object to the extent 19 it calls for a legal conclusion. 20 THE WITNESS: I didn't know. 21 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 22 Q Do you remember anything about your brother 23 Tyler selling his shares back to Widen 24 Colourgraphics? 25 A No.</p>	<p>1 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 2 Q Did you review this first amendment -- it's 3 actually just called amendment. Did you review 4 the September 12, 2001, amendment of shareholder 5 agreement of Widen Colourgraphics that I handed 6 you as Exhibit 5 prior to signing it? 7 A No. 8 Q Do you think you reviewed it after signing it? 9 A I can't say. I don't remember. 10 Q Why do you think you didn't review it? 11 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. 12 Mischaracterizes her testimony. 13 THE WITNESS: Can you -- 14 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 15 Q Sure. 16 A Yeah. Why do I think I didn't -- 17 Q Let me go back to address counsel's objection. 18 Do you remember whether or not you reviewed it, 19 Exhibit 5? 20 A I don't believe I did. 21 Q And why do you believe that? 22 A Again, because my dad probably just gave us all 23 the signature page and told us to sign it. 24 Q Do you actually remember that that's the way it 25 happened or you are speculating?</p>
Page 58	Page 60
<p>1 Q So you don't remember maybe why he did that? 2 A You said sold them back to Widen? 3 Q Right. If you look at paragraph 3 on that first 4 page, do you have any recollection of Tyler 5 being less involved in the business? 6 A Yes. 7 Q Do you remember why? 8 A Yes. 9 Q What was the reason? 10 A Because my dad told him that he was going to be 11 taking over the business as president and then 12 changed his mind said he was going to appoint 13 Reed. 14 Q So Tyler wanted to be more involved, and he 15 wasn't allowed to be. Is that what you are 16 saying? 17 A Tyler wanted to be president. 18 Q And is that your understanding as to why Tyler 19 sold his shares or you don't remember Tyler 20 choosing to sell his shares? 21 A I did not know that Tyler sold his shares. 22 Q Do you remember that you got more shares because 23 Tyler sold his shares? 24 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Form. 25 THE WITNESS: I did not know.</p>	<p>1 A I remember that that's the way he did it, sign 2 here. 3 Q Was it important for you at the time to review a 4 document like this before signing it? 5 A No. 6 Q Why not? 7 A I trusted my dad. 8 Q And you didn't believe your dad was being unfair 9 to you? 10 A Correct. 11 Q Do you recall whether you had an attorney 12 representing you with respect to the execution 13 of this document? 14 A I did not have an attorney. 15 Q Do you recall whether any of your brothers had 16 an attorney that they were using? 17 A I wouldn't know that. 18 Q When you signed -- if you recall, when you 19 signed a document like this, would you all get 20 together and sign at the same time or would you 21 sign separately? 22 A Most of the time we all signed at the same time. 23 Q Can you remember a specific example that you 24 could walk me through where that happened? 25 A My mom and dad always had Sunday dinner, and</p>

Page 61	Page 63
<p>1 this is the type of stuff that he would bring</p> <p>2 when we were all there and told us to sign it.</p> <p>3 Q And when you say "he," you mean your father?</p> <p>4 A My dad.</p> <p>5 Q And how were those dinners? Were those good</p> <p>6 events, bad events?</p> <p>7 A Horrible.</p> <p>8 Q Why do you say that?</p> <p>9 A Because he sat at the head of the table, and it</p> <p>10 was a glass dining room table, and he'd pound</p> <p>11 his fists and just told us what losers we were</p> <p>12 and just verbal abuse pretty much every Sunday.</p> <p>13 Q Did you know when you were going to the dinners</p> <p>14 that there might be business that was going to</p> <p>15 be discussed?</p> <p>16 A Never.</p> <p>17 Q Was it common that your dad would discuss</p> <p>18 business at the Sunday dinners?</p> <p>19 A Only when Widens wasn't doing well.</p> <p>20 Q But he wouldn't tell you necessarily ahead of</p> <p>21 time that I need you to review a document?</p> <p>22 A Never.</p> <p>23 Q How did your father communicate with you, let's</p> <p>24 say at this time frame in September of 2001?</p> <p>25 Would he call you on the phone to say come to</p>	<p>1 Q Did your children attend also?</p> <p>2 A Yes.</p> <p>3 Q Did you ever discuss with Steven your thoughts</p> <p>4 about the Sunday dinners?</p> <p>5 A Well, the first time he witnessed it as most of</p> <p>6 the in-laws they were horrified and shocked.</p> <p>7 They'd never seen a family operate like that.</p> <p>8 Q How big was the table that you're talking about,</p> <p>9 like how many people did it seat?</p> <p>10 A I can't remember offhand. It was a big, long</p> <p>11 table.</p> <p>12 Q Is it your memory that everybody sat at the</p> <p>13 table including children and spouses?</p> <p>14 A The kids sat at the table when they got older.</p> <p>15 Q It's my understanding that you don't have a</p> <p>16 specific recollection of the day that you signed</p> <p>17 this document?</p> <p>18 A I do not.</p> <p>19 Q Is it possible that you did not sign it at</p> <p>20 Sunday dinner, in other words, might you have</p> <p>21 signed it at the office?</p> <p>22 A No.</p> <p>23 Q Why is that not possible?</p> <p>24 A Because we always signed them on Sunday dinner.</p> <p>25 Q Did your dad have an office at the Widen</p>
Page 62	Page 64
<p>1 Sunday dinner?</p> <p>2 A No. We all just always went to Sunday dinner.</p> <p>3 It was expected of us.</p> <p>4 Q What about communications with your mom at the</p> <p>5 time, would she communicate with you about</p> <p>6 dinner ahead of time and say, hey, are you</p> <p>7 coming to Sunday dinner?</p> <p>8 A No.</p> <p>9 Q How was your relationship with your mom?</p> <p>10 A Very good.</p> <p>11 Q Where did she sit at the table?</p> <p>12 A The other end.</p> <p>13 Q Did you always sit in the same place?</p> <p>14 A Yes.</p> <p>15 Q Next to your father?</p> <p>16 A Yes.</p> <p>17 Q If the dinners were so horrible, why did you go?</p> <p>18 A It was expected of us.</p> <p>19 Q Did you ever say, I'm not going?</p> <p>20 A Never.</p> <p>21 Q Did Steven go with you?</p> <p>22 A Yes.</p> <p>23 Q Did you have children at the time, and to be</p> <p>24 specific let's say 2001?</p> <p>25 A Yes.</p>	<p>1 business building?</p> <p>2 A Yes.</p> <p>3 Q Do you recall where it was located at the time?</p> <p>4 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Form.</p> <p>5 Are we still talking about 2001?</p> <p>6 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>7 Q Yeah. So in 2001 where was Widens building?</p> <p>8 A We had two.</p> <p>9 Q Okay. And did your father have an office in one</p> <p>10 of the buildings?</p> <p>11 A He had an office in the old building and in the</p> <p>12 new building.</p> <p>13 Q And did you ever meet with him at the old</p> <p>14 building in his office?</p> <p>15 A Yes.</p> <p>16 Q And did he ever call you into his office at the</p> <p>17 old building to sign documents?</p> <p>18 A I don't think so. I don't know.</p> <p>19 Q He had an office in the new building as well?</p> <p>20 A Yes.</p> <p>21 Q In this time frame, 2001?</p> <p>22 A I can't remember when they built the new one.</p> <p>23 Q Did your father ever call you into his office in</p> <p>24 the new building to sign documents?</p> <p>25 A No.</p>

Page 65	Page 67
<p>1 Q In Exhibit <u>5</u>, the same document, Ms. Randall, if</p> <p>2 you would turn to the page -- you're on it --</p> <p>3 directly after the signature page. This is</p> <p>4 titled Exhibit A. Do you see that?</p> <p>5 A Yes.</p> <p>6 Q And similar to the 1992 agreement that we went</p> <p>7 over, this is a listing of shares of stock. Do</p> <p>8 you agree with that?</p> <p>9 A Yes.</p> <p>10 Q And the numbers -- and you can compare it to</p> <p>11 Exhibit <u>4</u>, the numbers have changed. Would you</p> <p>12 agree with me?</p> <p>13 A Yes.</p> <p>14 Q Do you recall -- let me first just remark what</p> <p>15 this document Exhibit <u>5</u> indicates. Under your</p> <p>16 name with an address of 5106 Rustic Way,</p> <p>17 McFarland. Do you see that?</p> <p>18 A Yes.</p> <p>19 Q And that's where you were living at the time?</p> <p>20 A Yes.</p> <p>21 Q You have under Class A common stock 232.75</p> <p>22 shares. Do you see that?</p> <p>23 A I do.</p> <p>24 Q If you go back to the 1992 agreement, see, we're</p> <p>25 already going back to the document. You asked.</p>	<p>1 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>2 Q Which document are you looking at?</p> <p>3 A The --</p> <p>4 Q Right. So --</p> <p>5 A These are commas.</p> <p>6 Q Yes. And then look at Exhibit <u>5</u>.</p> <p>7 A Yes, those are dots.</p> <p>8 Q I agree. So some are commas and some are dots.</p> <p>9 I agree. Do you recall specifically with</p> <p>10 respect to Exhibit <u>5</u>, the later document, why</p> <p>11 your shares were different from, for example,</p> <p>12 Reed's under Class A common stock?</p> <p>13 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for</p> <p>14 speculation. Legal conclusion.</p> <p>15 THE WITNESS: I don't know why.</p> <p>16 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>17 Q Do you agree that Reed has more Class A common</p> <p>18 stock shares listed than you do?</p> <p>19 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for</p> <p>20 a legal conclusion.</p> <p>21 THE WITNESS: That Reed has more than</p> <p>22 I?</p> <p>23 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>24 Q Yeah. You can -- to reduce potential confusion,</p> <p>25 you can put Exhibit <u>4</u> away now, the older one,</p>
Page 66	Page 68
<p>1 I know. If you go back to the 1992 agreement</p> <p>2 and if you turn to what effectively is page 19</p> <p>3 of the document --</p> <p>4 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Of Exhibit <u>4</u>?</p> <p>5 MR. CHURCHILL: Yes. Exhibit <u>4</u>.</p> <p>6 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Here you go.</p> <p>7 THE WITNESS: 19.</p> <p>8 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>9 Q Yeah, it will be right after 18. Do you agree</p> <p>10 that your shares have changed between the 1992</p> <p>11 agreement and the 2001 agreement? Do you see</p> <p>12 that?</p> <p>13 A I see that.</p> <p>14 Q And also with respect to Class B common stock</p> <p>15 whereas in 1992 you had 56,790 and in the 2000</p> <p>16 agreement you have 5,063.9025. Do you see that?</p> <p>17 A Is that a point or a comma?</p> <p>18 Q I think it's a decimal.</p> <p>19 A Yes, I see that.</p> <p>20 Q And your Class A common stock has gone up from</p> <p>21 4,655 shares to 232.75 shares, correct?</p> <p>22 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Form.</p> <p>23 THE WITNESS: It looks like it to me,</p> <p>24 but this definitely isn't a decimal sign or a period.</p> <p>25 It's a comma.</p>	<p>1 and just focus on the newer one. Put that one</p> <p>2 away. Okay. So let's focus on the 2001</p> <p>3 document.</p> <p>4 You agree that Reed has more Class A</p> <p>5 common stock shares listed than you, correct?</p> <p>6 A It appears that way, yes.</p> <p>7 Q Do you recall why that was the case?</p> <p>8 A I wouldn't know.</p> <p>9 Q And in turn, you agree that you have more Class</p> <p>10 B common stock shares listed than Reed does?</p> <p>11 He's directly below you. You agree with that as</p> <p>12 well?</p> <p>13 A Yes.</p> <p>14 Q And do you have a recollection of why that was</p> <p>15 the case?</p> <p>16 A No, I don't.</p> <p>17 Q Do you recall whether or not you questioned why</p> <p>18 Reed had more Class A common stock shares than</p> <p>19 you at that time in 2001?</p> <p>20 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Form.</p> <p>21 THE WITNESS: I didn't see this</p> <p>22 document.</p> <p>23 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>24 Q When you say that, you mean you don't believe</p> <p>25 you saw this document at the time that you</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 69</p> <p>1 signed it?</p> <p>2 A That's correct.</p> <p>3 Q Do you believe that you ever saw Exhibit A?</p> <p>4 A I can say I never saw this.</p> <p>5 Q Are you guessing that you never saw it, or</p> <p>6 you're confident that you never saw it?</p> <p>7 A I'm confident that I never saw it.</p> <p>8 Q And why is that, Ms. Randall?</p> <p>9 A Because we signed these at the Sunday dinner</p> <p>10 table and this was all we saw.</p> <p>11 Q And you were just pointing at a document. When</p> <p>12 you say this was all you saw, you mean the</p> <p>13 signature page?</p> <p>14 A The signature.</p> <p>15 Q I know this goes back some time, but do you have</p> <p>16 a recollection in your mind of when you first</p> <p>17 realized that your shares in the company might</p> <p>18 be different than your brothers?</p> <p>19 A I did not -- after -- after my dad passed away,</p> <p>20 I know something went on about A and B and</p> <p>21 different types of stock because we got a letter</p> <p>22 from -- I don't know if it was Kilkelly or if it</p> <p>23 was from Dan Harding who is the estate attorney</p> <p>24 saying that Reed was going to do this, whatever</p> <p>25 it was. I didn't understand it, and I remember</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 71</p> <p>1 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Legal</p> <p>2 conclusion.</p> <p>3 THE WITNESS: No. I don't think -- I</p> <p>4 don't remember. I don't think so, but I can't</p> <p>5 remember. I didn't really understand it.</p> <p>6 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>7 Q Did you feel like you needed to have an attorney</p> <p>8 help you with respect to understanding the first</p> <p>9 amendment to the 1992 shareholder agreement?</p> <p>10 A No.</p> <p>11 Q Are you making a claim or are you contesting in</p> <p>12 this lawsuit the adjustment of your brothers</p> <p>13 shares as represented in the first amendment to</p> <p>14 the 1992 shareholder agreement?</p> <p>15 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for</p> <p>16 a legal conclusion. Foundation.</p> <p>17 THE WITNESS: I would probably have to</p> <p>18 talk with my lawyers about that.</p> <p>19 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>20 Q Are you questioning whether or not the change in</p> <p>21 the share ownership in the first amendment -- as</p> <p>22 represented in the first amendment was proper?</p> <p>23 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Same objections.</p> <p>24 THE WITNESS: I wouldn't know.</p> <p>25 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 70</p> <p>1 calling my youngest brother Price because he and</p> <p>2 I were executors. And I said, "What is this</p> <p>3 thing we're supposed to sign about Reed?" And</p> <p>4 he said, "Stac, just sign it. Reed's going</p> <p>5 to -- Reed's going to do what Reed wants to do."</p> <p>6 So that's the only time I knew there was any</p> <p>7 type of exchange of stocks.</p> <p>8 Q So you understood with respect to that</p> <p>9 communication that that concerned a difference</p> <p>10 in stock ownership or share ownership?</p> <p>11 A An A and a B is all I know.</p> <p>12 Q Before coming here to today's deposition have</p> <p>13 you ever reviewed a document such as Exhibit 5</p> <p>14 that lists ownership of Class A and Class B</p> <p>15 stock involving you?</p> <p>16 A I can't say for sure.</p> <p>17 Q Was it important to you in 2001 to know how many</p> <p>18 shares you had in the company?</p> <p>19 A I assumed I knew.</p> <p>20 Q What do you think you knew?</p> <p>21 A That I had 20 percent of the company.</p> <p>22 Q And so when you signed the 2001 amendment to the</p> <p>23 shareholder agreement, you did not believe that</p> <p>24 your shares might be adjusted under that</p> <p>25 document?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 72</p> <p>1 Q You would need to talk to your attorneys?</p> <p>2 A Yes.</p> <p>3 Q You agree that your Class A common stock share</p> <p>4 amount represented in Exhibit 5 is the same as</p> <p>5 Stewart and Price, correct?</p> <p>6 A Yes.</p> <p>7 Q And you agree that your Class B common stock</p> <p>8 amount is the same as your brothers Stewart and</p> <p>9 Price, correct?</p> <p>10 A Yes.</p> <p>11 Q You were never employed by Windy Waters,</p> <p>12 correct?</p> <p>13 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for</p> <p>14 a legal conclusion.</p> <p>15 THE WITNESS: I don't recall where I</p> <p>16 was employed. I thought it was Widen Colourgraphics</p> <p>17 or Widen Enterprises.</p> <p>18 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>19 Q Do you remember receiving a paycheck at any</p> <p>20 time?</p> <p>21 A Yes.</p> <p>22 Q Do you remember who wrote the paychecks --</p> <p>23 sorry, what company's name was on the paychecks?</p> <p>24 A That's a long time ago. I can't recall.</p> <p>25 Q We were talking a little bit before about the</p>

Page 73	Page 75
<p>1 fact that Tyler wanted to be president and that 2 didn't happen. Do you remember that testimony? 3 A Yes. 4 Q Was there some reason why Tyler wasn't the 5 person that became president, do you remember? 6 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for 7 speculation. 8 THE WITNESS: I wasn't involved in any 9 of that. I don't know. 10 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 11 Q Do you know whether Tyler's vision of the 12 company was different than Reed's, for example? 13 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Same objection. 14 THE WITNESS: I don't know what Tyler 15 was thinking. 16 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 17 Q The time that you were working as a receptionist 18 in 2000, 2001, do you remember that? 19 A Yes. 20 Q I wanted to go back to that. You were 21 terminated from that position as well; isn't 22 that correct? 23 A Yes, I was. 24 Q And do you recall the circumstances under which 25 you were terminated?</p>	<p>1 A Not Reed, no. 2 Q Do you recall anyone raising a question about 3 whether or not you had been drinking at lunch on 4 the job? 5 A Yes. 6 Q Did Reed tell you that you were being terminated 7 because you had been drinking on the job? 8 A No. 9 Q Did anyone ever say that that was a reason why 10 you were terminated for that receptionist 11 position? 12 A No. 13 Q To this day have you ever heard anybody say that 14 was the reason you were terminated? 15 MS. POLAKOWSKI: I will object and 16 caution you not to disclose conversations you have 17 had with counsel. 18 THE WITNESS: Can you repeat the 19 question, please? 20 MR. CHURCHILL: Can you read it back? 21 (Last question read back.) 22 THE WITNESS: No. 23 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 24 Q Ms. Randall, at a certain point you took on the 25 office of president of Windy Waters; isn't that</p>
Page 74	Page 76
<p>1 A I was told or maybe Reed -- I was told by Reed 2 that Brian Becker said -- maybe I went to Reed's 3 office. Brian Becker told Reed that his clients 4 were complaining because his phone calls weren't 5 answered. 6 Q And who was Brian Becker? 7 A He was a sales rep or something. I'm not sure 8 what he did. He had numerous jobs. 9 Q And if I understand your testimony correctly, 10 you're saying that Brian said his phones weren't 11 being answered? 12 A His phone calls, answered all the calls that 13 came in. And you don't really like that job 14 anyway, do you? I said, "No, I can't stand it." 15 Q Who said that to you? 16 A Reed. I would pace back and forth. I 17 couldn't -- my dad kind of made me take that 18 job, and I said, no, I really don't, and he 19 said, "Well, why don't you just go," and, again, 20 I said okay. 21 Q Anything else? 22 A No. 23 Q Do you recall Reed raising a question about 24 whether or not you had been drinking at lunch, 25 drinking meaning alcohol at lunch?</p>	<p>1 correct? 2 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. 3 Foundation. 4 THE WITNESS: I don't know. 5 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 6 Q You don't know whether or not you ever served as 7 president of Windy Waters? 8 A No. 9 Q Is it a surprise to you that I'm asking you 10 whether or not you served as president of Windy 11 Waters? 12 A I was told by my attorneys. 13 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Stop 14 talking. 15 (Exhibit No. 6 was marked.) 16 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 17 Q You have been handed by the court reporter 18 what's been marked as Exhibit 6 to your 19 deposition, and this is one of those documents 20 that the order is a little funky. So I'm going 21 to have you turn to page 2. That really is kind 22 of the beginning of the document. It's 23 double-sided. It's the page you're looking at 24 now, Ms. Randall. The front page is actually 25 related to the document, and it's a consent to</p>

Page 77	Page 79
<p>1 shareholder agreement. We're probably not going</p> <p>2 to look at that. The real beginning of this</p> <p>3 document is Bates labeled in the bottom right</p> <p>4 corner. You will see Windy0033092. Do you see</p> <p>5 that?</p> <p>6 A Yes.</p> <p>7 Q And then there are several more pages in the</p> <p>8 document, and there's some more of those</p> <p>9 consents in the back. So Exhibit 6 to your</p> <p>10 deposition is titled Second Amendment to</p> <p>11 Shareholder Agreement. Do you see that at the</p> <p>12 top?</p> <p>13 A Yes.</p> <p>14 Q And on the third page of the exhibit, second</p> <p>15 page of the agreement, Bates number Windy0033093</p> <p>16 is a page that has some signature lines on it.</p> <p>17 Do you see that as well?</p> <p>18 A Yes.</p> <p>19 Q And do you see under Windy Waters, Inc., your</p> <p>20 name Stacy Widen Randall, president?</p> <p>21 A I do.</p> <p>22 Q And do you see your signature there?</p> <p>23 A Yes.</p> <p>24 Q And then do you also see under shareholders on</p> <p>25 the right side Reed C. Widen, Stacy Widen</p>	<p>1 somebody signed for you?</p> <p>2 A I can't say.</p> <p>3 Q What about the version of your signature under</p> <p>4 Windy Waters, Inc., is that your signature where</p> <p>5 it says, "Stacy Widen Randall, president"?</p> <p>6 A That one is also questionable. I can't say for</p> <p>7 sure.</p> <p>8 Q And can you tell me -- let's go through each</p> <p>9 one. What's questionable about it? Why are you</p> <p>10 saying that?</p> <p>11 A It does not look like my signature.</p> <p>12 Q Do you have any recollection of speaking to</p> <p>13 anyone about the second amendment to shareholder</p> <p>14 agreement and your need to sign it?</p> <p>15 A I don't remember.</p> <p>16 Q If you -- does this help at all with your</p> <p>17 recollection of serving as president of Windy</p> <p>18 Waters?</p> <p>19 A Recollection?</p> <p>20 Q Yeah. Does seeing this document remind you at</p> <p>21 all that you did have a role as president of</p> <p>22 Windy Waters?</p> <p>23 A It does not.</p> <p>24 Q Other than I'm assuming your meetings with</p> <p>25 counsel, which I don't want you to talk about,</p>
Page 78	Page 80
<p>1 Randall and Price Widen?</p> <p>2 A I do.</p> <p>3 Q And do you see your signature there?</p> <p>4 A Yes.</p> <p>5 Q And those signatures from you, they aren't the</p> <p>6 same signature, correct?</p> <p>7 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection.</p> <p>8 Foundation.</p> <p>9 THE WITNESS: What do you mean by</p> <p>10 that?</p> <p>11 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>12 Q Well, I'm not a handwriting expert, but would</p> <p>13 you say in looking at the two different</p> <p>14 signatures that they are not identical?</p> <p>15 A Yes.</p> <p>16 Q Do you have a recollection of signing Exhibit 6,</p> <p>17 the portion that has your signature on it?</p> <p>18 A I don't remember.</p> <p>19 Q But you don't have any reason to doubt that that</p> <p>20 is your signature, correct, in both places?</p> <p>21 A I'm pretty sure the one under Reed Widen is not</p> <p>22 mine.</p> <p>23 Q Why do you say that?</p> <p>24 A Because that's not how I signed my name.</p> <p>25 Q So are you -- are you saying that you think</p>	<p>1 do you have a recollection of seeing this</p> <p>2 document?</p> <p>3 A I do not.</p> <p>4 Q So I take it you don't know how long you may</p> <p>5 have served as president of Windy Waters,</p> <p>6 assuming that you held that title?</p> <p>7 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Form.</p> <p>8 THE WITNESS: Assuming -- I</p> <p>9 wouldn't -- I don't -- I don't remember any of it.</p> <p>10 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>11 Q Do you remember ever holding any meetings as</p> <p>12 president of Windy Waters?</p> <p>13 A No meetings were held.</p> <p>14 Q In this time frame, which is you will see back</p> <p>15 on the first page of the agreement, second page</p> <p>16 of the exhibit, May 7, 2007, do you see that?</p> <p>17 A Mm-hmm. I do.</p> <p>18 Q So in the 2007 time frame, do you remember what</p> <p>19 your involvement was with respect to Widen</p> <p>20 Enterprises?</p> <p>21 A I was a director.</p> <p>22 Q You were a director of Widen Enterprises or of</p> <p>23 Windy Waters?</p> <p>24 A That I'm not sure.</p> <p>25 Q You were not employed at that time by Widen</p>

Page 81	Page 83
<p>1 Enterprises, correct?</p> <p>2 A Correct.</p> <p>3 Q Do you remember whether or not you were</p> <p>4 reviewing any financial documents of Widen</p> <p>5 Enterprises --</p> <p>6 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection.</p> <p>7 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>8 Q -- in 2007?</p> <p>9 A I can't say for sure. I don't remember.</p> <p>10 Q Do you remember in this time frame, 2007,</p> <p>11 whether or not any financial documents were</p> <p>12 provided to you?</p> <p>13 A No, they were not.</p> <p>14 Q When I say "financial documents," what do you</p> <p>15 think that means, like what does it mean to you?</p> <p>16 A Checkbook, bank accounts, anything that has to</p> <p>17 do with money.</p> <p>18 Q Profit and loss statements?</p> <p>19 A Mm-hmm.</p> <p>20 Q That's a "yes"?</p> <p>21 A Yes.</p> <p>22 Q Revenues, revenue statements?</p> <p>23 A Yes. I don't -- yes.</p> <p>24 Q Do you know who would have made the decision --</p> <p>25 I'm asking you to speculate -- do you know who</p>	<p>1 Q Until this lawsuit. You agree that you asked</p> <p>2 with respect to this lawsuit, correct?</p> <p>3 A I would not agree with that.</p> <p>4 Q You would agree that your attorneys have asked</p> <p>5 for the financial records with respect to this</p> <p>6 lawsuit?</p> <p>7 A I'm not aware of that. I don't know.</p> <p>8 Q Did anyone ever tell you that you could not have</p> <p>9 financial records for Widen Enterprises?</p> <p>10 A No.</p> <p>11 Q Did anyone ever tell you that you could not have</p> <p>12 financial records for Windy Waters?</p> <p>13 A No.</p> <p>14 Q You said that you had served as a director,</p> <p>15 correct?</p> <p>16 A Yes.</p> <p>17 Q And you didn't associate or differentiate</p> <p>18 between being a director of Windy Waters versus</p> <p>19 being a director of Widen Enterprises, correct?</p> <p>20 A Correct.</p> <p>21 Q Do you remember what period of time you served</p> <p>22 as a director?</p> <p>23 A I do not remember when it started.</p> <p>24 Q Were you a director back in 2000 and 2001 when</p> <p>25 you were working as a receptionist at Widen?</p>
Page 82	Page 84
<p>1 would have made a decision to appoint you as</p> <p>2 president of Windy Waters?</p> <p>3 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for</p> <p>4 a legal conclusion and speculation.</p> <p>5 THE WITNESS: I wouldn't -- I have no</p> <p>6 idea.</p> <p>7 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>8 Q Do you know who was the president of Windy</p> <p>9 Waters prior to 2007?</p> <p>10 A No.</p> <p>11 Q Do you know who was the president of Windy</p> <p>12 Waters at any point in time?</p> <p>13 A No.</p> <p>14 Q Are you aware whether at the time that you</p> <p>15 redeemed your shares in May 2020, so the final</p> <p>16 redemption, whether you were then resigning as</p> <p>17 president of Windy Waters as well?</p> <p>18 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for</p> <p>19 a legal conclusion. Calls for speculation.</p> <p>20 THE WITNESS: I would not know. I</p> <p>21 don't know. I don't remember.</p> <p>22 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>23 Q Do you recall a time that you ever asked to see</p> <p>24 the financial records of Widen Enterprises?</p> <p>25 A I never did.</p>	<p>1 A Yes.</p> <p>2 Q Were you a director back in 1992 when the 1992</p> <p>3 shareholder agreement was signed?</p> <p>4 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for</p> <p>5 a legal conclusion.</p> <p>6 THE WITNESS: I don't remember.</p> <p>7 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>8 Q In your capacity as a director, did you ever</p> <p>9 talk to other directors about the performance of</p> <p>10 Widen Enterprises?</p> <p>11 A I did.</p> <p>12 Q Okay. And what type of conversations are you</p> <p>13 thinking of?</p> <p>14 A It was just how -- with Reed, how is the company</p> <p>15 doing.</p> <p>16 Q And when would you have conversations like that?</p> <p>17 A Normally they were up north at our cottage.</p> <p>18 Q And where is the cottage located?</p> <p>19 A Boulder Junction, Wisconsin.</p> <p>20 Q And when you say "up north," you mean north of</p> <p>21 here?</p> <p>22 A Yes. Boulder Junction is north of here.</p> <p>23 Q How far is it?</p> <p>24 A 257 miles from my door step to that door step.</p> <p>25 Q And how long have you made that trip to the</p>

Page 85	Page 87
<p>1 cottage?</p> <p>2 A Since I was a baby.</p> <p>3 Q In your role as a director did you ever</p> <p>4 establish any company policies?</p> <p>5 A No.</p> <p>6 Q In your role as a director did you ever revise</p> <p>7 any company policies?</p> <p>8 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Form.</p> <p>9 Calls for a legal conclusion.</p> <p>10 THE WITNESS: Not that I remember.</p> <p>11 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>12 Q In your role as a director did you ever review</p> <p>13 any company policies?</p> <p>14 A No.</p> <p>15 Q In your role as a director did you ever hire</p> <p>16 anyone?</p> <p>17 A No.</p> <p>18 Q In your role as a director did you ever fire</p> <p>19 anyone?</p> <p>20 A No.</p> <p>21 Q In your role as a director did you ever inquire</p> <p>22 about an employee's compensation?</p> <p>23 A No.</p> <p>24 Q In your role as a director did you ever set</p> <p>25 anyone's compensation, like the amount?</p>	<p>1 A They changed their name. It was -- gosh.</p> <p>2 Virtual -- what was it? Was it Virtual Krause.</p> <p>3 Baker Tilly is now something -- it's a different</p> <p>4 name than the original name.</p> <p>5 Q They were called something before and then they</p> <p>6 became Baker Tilly?</p> <p>7 A Yes.</p> <p>8 Q Did you ever consult with the predecessor</p> <p>9 entity?</p> <p>10 A No.</p> <p>11 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Object to form.</p> <p>12 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>13 Q Ms. Randall, have you heard of the term before</p> <p>14 fiduciary duty?</p> <p>15 A I have heard it, yes.</p> <p>16 Q What is your understanding of what a fiduciary</p> <p>17 duty is?</p> <p>18 MS. POLAKOWSKI: I will object to the</p> <p>19 extent that the question would require you disclose</p> <p>20 information that was discussed between yourself and</p> <p>21 counsel. I will instruct you not to answer. If you</p> <p>22 have an understanding independent of what we have</p> <p>23 told you, you can provide that.</p> <p>24 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>25 Q Do you have an independent understanding outside</p>
Page 86	Page 88
<p>1 A No.</p> <p>2 Q In your role as a director did you ever declare</p> <p>3 any dividends for shareholders?</p> <p>4 A No.</p> <p>5 Q In your role as a director did you ever consult</p> <p>6 with any advisors to Widen Enterprises?</p> <p>7 A No.</p> <p>8 Q Did you ever consult with any advisors to Windy</p> <p>9 Waters?</p> <p>10 A No.</p> <p>11 Q In your role as a director did you ever meet</p> <p>12 with attorneys to the companies?</p> <p>13 A No.</p> <p>14 Q In your role as a director did you ever consult</p> <p>15 with accountants to either company?</p> <p>16 A No.</p> <p>17 Q Let's say in this time frame, 2007, did you know</p> <p>18 who were accountants to the company?</p> <p>19 A No, I don't.</p> <p>20 Q Did you ever use Baker Tilly, the firm Baker</p> <p>21 Tilly?</p> <p>22 A Yes.</p> <p>23 Q Do you remember whether Baker Tilly were the</p> <p>24 accountants to the company in 2007 to either</p> <p>25 company?</p>	<p>1 of your conversations with counsel about what a</p> <p>2 fiduciary duty is?</p> <p>3 A I always just thought it was -- yeah, that it</p> <p>4 had to do with a person that was looking out for</p> <p>5 my best interest.</p> <p>6 Q Did you have an understanding that fiduciary</p> <p>7 duties can be owed to shareholders?</p> <p>8 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Same objection and</p> <p>9 same instruction.</p> <p>10 THE WITNESS: No.</p> <p>11 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>12 Q Did you understand in your role as a director</p> <p>13 that you might owe fiduciary duties to anyone?</p> <p>14 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Same objection.</p> <p>15 Calls for a legal conclusion.</p> <p>16 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>17 Q Do you understand my question?</p> <p>18 A Repeat it, please.</p> <p>19 Q Sure. Let me break it down a little bit. So</p> <p>20 you testified that you were a director, right?</p> <p>21 A Yes.</p> <p>22 Q And you knew that you were a director?</p> <p>23 A Yes.</p> <p>24 Q Although you're not sure as to which company you</p> <p>25 were a director?</p>

Page 89	Page 91
<p>1 A Correct.</p> <p>2 Q At the time that you were serving as a director,</p> <p>3 did you believe that you owed fiduciary duties</p> <p>4 to anyone?</p> <p>5 A I was not sure what fiduciary duties was. So I</p> <p>6 didn't know.</p> <p>7 Q In your role as a director did you believe that</p> <p>8 you had any type of duty to anyone other than</p> <p>9 yourself?</p> <p>10 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for</p> <p>11 a legal conclusion.</p> <p>12 THE WITNESS: Can you rephrase that,</p> <p>13 please?</p> <p>14 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>15 Q Let me try it this way. So backing away from</p> <p>16 fiduciary duty because my understanding of your</p> <p>17 testimony just now is that you didn't consider</p> <p>18 fiduciary duty like as a legal concept at the</p> <p>19 time. In your role when you were serving as a</p> <p>20 director, did you consider that you had any type</p> <p>21 of duty or obligation to anyone other than</p> <p>22 yourself with respect to your role with the</p> <p>23 companies?</p> <p>24 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Object to the extent</p> <p>25 that it calls for a legal conclusion.</p>	<p>1 Q And why do you know that?</p> <p>2 A The signature stamp was more bold and darker.</p> <p>3 Q Okay. The signature stamp was first an issue</p> <p>4 that came up after you moved to Florida, right?</p> <p>5 A Yes.</p> <p>6 Q And do you remember when you moved to Florida in</p> <p>7 2001, roughly when?</p> <p>8 A December.</p> <p>9 Q What precipitated or caused that decision to</p> <p>10 move to Florida?</p> <p>11 A Can you ask me that in a different way?</p> <p>12 Q Yeah. Why did you move?</p> <p>13 A To get away from my dad.</p> <p>14 Q Any other reasons?</p> <p>15 A No.</p> <p>16 Q Did you move with the rest of your family?</p> <p>17 A I moved with my husband and my youngest child</p> <p>18 because she was still in high school.</p> <p>19 Q Justin did not go with you?</p> <p>20 A No.</p> <p>21 Q And what's your daughter's name?</p> <p>22 A Lindsey.</p> <p>23 Q A-Y?</p> <p>24 A L-I-N-D-S-E-Y.</p> <p>25 Q E-Y. And so in December of 2001 you were not</p>
Page 90	Page 92
<p>1 THE WITNESS: I wouldn't know that.</p> <p>2 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>3 Q It wasn't something that was in your mindset at</p> <p>4 the time?</p> <p>5 A No.</p> <p>6 Q Let's look at the second amendment again and</p> <p>7 back to your signature.</p> <p>8 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Is that Exhibit <u>5</u>?</p> <p>9 MR. CHURCHILL: That is Exhibit <u>6</u>.</p> <p>10 THE WITNESS: I have got it.</p> <p>11 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>12 Q Exhibit <u>6</u>. So I wanted to look at your</p> <p>13 signature again, and with that in your mind,</p> <p>14 you're aware that the question of the use of a</p> <p>15 signature stamp has come up in this litigation,</p> <p>16 right?</p> <p>17 A Yes.</p> <p>18 Q And the signature stamp that we're talking about</p> <p>19 or at least one of them would be your signature</p> <p>20 stamp, correct?</p> <p>21 A Yes.</p> <p>22 Q As you sit here, can you tell whether or not one</p> <p>23 of the signatures on Exhibit <u>6</u> is the signature</p> <p>24 stamp?</p> <p>25 A It is not.</p>	<p>1 working for Widen Enterprises anymore?</p> <p>2 A No.</p> <p>3 Q But you were a director of Widen Enterprises at</p> <p>4 the time, correct?</p> <p>5 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection.</p> <p>6 Foundation.</p> <p>7 THE WITNESS: I don't know for sure.</p> <p>8 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>9 Q Do you know whether you were president of Windy</p> <p>10 Waters at the time?</p> <p>11 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Same objection.</p> <p>12 Calls for a legal conclusion.</p> <p>13 THE WITNESS: I didn't know that I was</p> <p>14 ever president.</p> <p>15 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>16 Q How did you notify, if at all, your family that</p> <p>17 you were moving to Florida?</p> <p>18 A I told my dad face to face. I don't recall how</p> <p>19 I told my brothers.</p> <p>20 Q And what part of Florida did you move to?</p> <p>21 A Tampa area.</p> <p>22 Q Were you concerned at all about being able to</p> <p>23 fulfill any responsibilities that you had to the</p> <p>24 companies by moving to Florida?</p> <p>25 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 93</p> <p>1 a legal conclusion. Also assumes facts not in 2 evidence. 3 THE WITNESS: I don't believe I was in 4 my right frame of mind when that was all going on. 5 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 6 Q Did you have -- in your mind did you have 7 responsibilities to the companies in 2001 when 8 you moved to Florida? 9 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Same objections. 10 THE WITNESS: I know that I had to 11 sign things. 12 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 13 Q And in what capacity were you signing things? 14 A What do you mean "capacity"? 15 Q You said that you had to sign things. Why did 16 you have to sign things? 17 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Object to the extent 18 it calls for a legal conclusion. 19 THE WITNESS: I don't know. 20 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 21 Q Well, you knew you had to sign things. Did you 22 believe you had to sign things because you were 23 a director? 24 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Same objection. 25 THE WITNESS: I wasn't sure why I had</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 95</p> <p>1 Q What about your dad? 2 A In '01 he wasn't doing much at the office. 3 Q Okay. So who was doing much at the office in 4 '01, Reed? 5 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. 6 Foundation. 7 THE WITNESS: I don't know what Reed 8 was doing. 9 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 10 Q I know this is back in time, but in 2001 when 11 you moved, who was running the companies? 12 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for 13 speculation. 14 THE WITNESS: I am not sure -- 15 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 16 Q So -- 17 A -- about that. 18 Q So you mentioned that you did tell your dad that 19 you were moving, right? 20 A Yes. 21 Q Did you tell your dad because you felt like he 22 was the person that needed to know from a 23 company perspective, or did you tell your dad 24 because he's your dad? 25 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 94</p> <p>1 to sign actually. 2 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 3 Q Did you believe that you had to sign things 4 because you were a shareholder? 5 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Same objection. 6 THE WITNESS: I didn't know why I had 7 to sign things. 8 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 9 Q But you knew that you had to sign things as 10 you're calling them? 11 A Documents. 12 Q So that was -- you have anticipated my next 13 question. What kind of things do you think you 14 would need to sign? 15 A Whatever Mike Kiesler asked me to sign. 16 Q That's the first time Mike's name has come up. 17 When did he first start getting involved in the 18 company as far as you can remember? 19 A I know my dad hired him. I don't recall when. 20 Q So in 2001 when you moved to Florida, do you 21 remember what position or role Mike Kiesler had? 22 A He was CFO. 23 Q And anybody else other than Mike Kiesler that 24 might need you to sign something? 25 A No.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 96</p> <p>1 speculation. 2 THE WITNESS: I told him because he's 3 my dad. 4 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 5 Q Were you concerned about your ability to sign 6 documents remotely? 7 A I was not. 8 Q Why were you not concerned? 9 A I don't think I even thought about it. 10 MS. POLAKOWSKI: We have been going 11 about another hour. At a convenient time can we take 12 a break whether for lunch or otherwise? 13 MR. CHURCHILL: Sure. 14 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 15 Q Let me just ask a couple more questions so we 16 can finish with that issue. 17 So you said you're not sure if you ever 18 thought about it. When did you first realize 19 I'm going to need to sign some things? 20 A When Kiesler sent me something to sign. 21 Q And do you remember what that was? 22 A I have no idea. 23 Q How often did Kiesler send you things to sign in 24 this time frame, let's say 2001, 2002? 25 A I don't remember.</p>

Page 97	Page 99
<p>1 Q Do you remember the types of things that you had 2 to sign? 3 A Pretty much stuff like sign this. 4 Q And Mike Kiesler is not your dad, so did he give 5 you the whole document or just the signature 6 page? 7 A I can't remember. 8 Q Would Mike Kiesler explain to you what it was 9 that he wanted you to sign or that they needed 10 signed? 11 A I don't remember for sure. 12 MR. CHURCHILL: We can take a break. 13 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We will go off the 14 record. The time is 11:43 a.m. 15 (Lunch recess taken.) 16 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the 17 record. This will mark the beginning of media unit 18 number 2 of the video recorded deposition of Stacy 19 Randall. Today's date is August 28th, 2023, and the 20 time is 12:39 p.m. 21 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 22 Q Good afternoon, Ms. Randall. 23 A Good afternoon. 24 Q Before we broke for lunch we had started talking 25 about your move to Florida. Do you recall that?</p>	<p>1 stamp was being used? 2 A No, there's not. 3 Q Can you tell me how you had the stamp made, like 4 the process? 5 A Well, I just signed a piece of paper at Staples, 6 and then they took it, and when I came back in I 7 went back and got it. 8 Q Are you left-handed? 9 A I am. 10 Q And so do you remember what type of pen you used 11 to sign it? 12 A No. 13 Q You were mentioning that the ink is a little 14 thicker on the stamp, correct? 15 A Yes. 16 Q Do you remember if it was a felt tip point pen 17 as opposed to a ball point pen? 18 A I paid no attention to that. I can't tell you. 19 Q Do you know if the stamp was supposed to be used 20 with a certain color ink or did that matter? 21 A It was self-inking. 22 Q How does that work? 23 A When you just press down on it and it turns 24 black. So I think when it turns upside down it 25 gets the ink, and then when you press it down,</p>
Page 98	Page 100
<p>1 A Yes. 2 Q And we were also talking about your signature as 3 well. Do you remember that? 4 A Mm-hmm. 5 Q I wanted to talk more about the stamp, your 6 signature stamp. 7 A Okay. 8 Q If I understand correctly, you purchased the 9 stamp from a Staples in Florida; is that 10 correct? 11 A No. 12 Q Where did you purchase the stamp from? 13 A Staples in Monona. 14 Q And is that in Wisconsin? 15 A Yes. It's about two miles from the office. 16 Q Do you have a recollection of when you purchased 17 the stamp? 18 A I don't. It was after '01. 19 Q Do you think it was in 2002? 20 A I can't even guess. 21 Q I have got a document that I'm pretty confident 22 is the stamp, and we will go over that so we can 23 try to figure out when it was used. 24 Is there a date in your mind when you 25 could say I know as of this date no question the</p>	<p>1 that was my signature. 2 Q I see. So there's ink in the stamp, you don't 3 use a blotter? 4 A Right. 5 Q I'm showing my age now. Do you remember how it 6 was that the decision to use a stamp came about? 7 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. 8 Foundation. 9 THE WITNESS: I don't know what Mike 10 Kiesler was thinking, no. 11 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 12 Q Isn't it true that one of your brothers was 13 using a stamp also? 14 A I'm not aware of that. 15 Q Do you remember having a conversation in Mike 16 Kiesler's office with your brother Stewart and 17 Mike where the fact that Stewart was using a 18 stamp came up? 19 A No. I don't recall that. 20 Q Do you ever remember any of your brothers 21 telling you that they sometimes use a signature 22 stamp instead of their ink signature? 23 A No, I don't remember that. 24 Q Is it your understanding that any of your family 25 sometimes used an ink stamp besides yourself?</p>

Page 101	Page 103
<p>1 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection.</p> <p>2 Foundation.</p> <p>3 THE WITNESS: I don't know.</p> <p>4 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>5 Q Tell me what you remember about whose decision</p> <p>6 it was to use the stamp, initially I mean?</p> <p>7 A I don't know who it was; either Reed or Kiesler.</p> <p>8 Q Was it your suggestion or Reed or Kiesler?</p> <p>9 A It was one of those two.</p> <p>10 Q Did you agree that the stamp was something that</p> <p>11 could be used on occasion?</p> <p>12 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Form.</p> <p>13 THE WITNESS: Well, it depended. I</p> <p>14 needed to know when they used it.</p> <p>15 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>16 Q Tell me what you recall about the conversation</p> <p>17 where it was decided that the stamp could be</p> <p>18 used on occasion.</p> <p>19 A I don't remember a conversation.</p> <p>20 Q Did you communicate with anyone, with the</p> <p>21 companies about the conditions under which your</p> <p>22 stamp could be used?</p> <p>23 A They were supposed to let me know.</p> <p>24 Q And who did you tell that to?</p> <p>25 A Mike Kiesler.</p>	<p>1 was Mike's idea to use the stamp?</p> <p>2 A I don't know if it was Reed or Mike who made the</p> <p>3 decision. I don't know.</p> <p>4 Q Did you agree to use the stamp when it was to be</p> <p>5 used? In other words, under the conditions did</p> <p>6 you say, yes, I agree that the stamp can be used</p> <p>7 under certain conditions?</p> <p>8 A I don't recall them ever asking except for in</p> <p>9 late -- I don't remember. Was it December or</p> <p>10 something he texted me or emailed me and asked</p> <p>11 me if I could use my stamp.</p> <p>12 Q You agree that you knew the stamp was going to</p> <p>13 be used at certain times because you got the</p> <p>14 stamp and gave it to Mike, right?</p> <p>15 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for</p> <p>16 speculation.</p> <p>17 THE WITNESS: I didn't agree with</p> <p>18 that. No.</p> <p>19 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>20 Q You purchased the stamp, right?</p> <p>21 A Yes.</p> <p>22 Q And you brought it to Mike Kiesler?</p> <p>23 A Yes.</p> <p>24 Q And you gave it to him?</p> <p>25 A Yes.</p>
Page 102	Page 104
<p>1 Q And did that happen on the telephone or over</p> <p>2 email?</p> <p>3 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Object to form.</p> <p>4 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>5 Q Do you understand my question?</p> <p>6 A You want to know --</p> <p>7 Q Don't guess. Let me tell you or let me reask</p> <p>8 it. I'm interested in you telling me about the</p> <p>9 conversation or communication you had with Mike</p> <p>10 Kiesler or Reed where it was decided when the</p> <p>11 stamp could be used. Do you remember discussing</p> <p>12 it with anyone?</p> <p>13 A I remember -- I remember a little bit of the</p> <p>14 conversation, yes.</p> <p>15 Q And who was the conversation with?</p> <p>16 A Mike Kiesler.</p> <p>17 Q What was said?</p> <p>18 A I told him that -- when he asked me about</p> <p>19 getting a stamp, I said I don't have a problem</p> <p>20 with that as long as you let me know when you're</p> <p>21 using it.</p> <p>22 Q And was that a conversation that was had in</p> <p>23 person or over the telephone?</p> <p>24 A That I don't remember.</p> <p>25 Q You said that he asked. What do you mean, it</p>	<p>1 Q Did you hand it to him yourself?</p> <p>2 A I don't remember that.</p> <p>3 Q Do you remember what you said to Mike when you</p> <p>4 gave him the stamp?</p> <p>5 A Here it is.</p> <p>6 Q Okay. And you understood that when the stamp</p> <p>7 was used, the stamp would be a substitute for</p> <p>8 your actual handwritten signature, correct?</p> <p>9 A That's what I was told.</p> <p>10 Q And you understood that, correct, you understood</p> <p>11 that it was going to be a substitute for your</p> <p>12 handwritten signature?</p> <p>13 A Yes. But they needed to ask me first or let me</p> <p>14 know first.</p> <p>15 Q I understand that part of your testimony as</p> <p>16 well. So tell me what you remember as well as</p> <p>17 you can remember about how you directed the</p> <p>18 stamp to be used?</p> <p>19 A When they needed my signature they could use the</p> <p>20 stamp as long as I was aware of it.</p> <p>21 Q And did it matter how they communicated with you</p> <p>22 to get your approval, for example, was text</p> <p>23 okay?</p> <p>24 A I don't recall if we talked about that.</p> <p>25 Q Did you ever text your approval to use the</p>

Page 105	Page 107
<p>1 signature?</p> <p>2 A Never.</p> <p>3 Q Was phone conversation okay to get your</p> <p>4 approval?</p> <p>5 A I don't recall ever a phone conversation.</p> <p>6 Q Were there any documents that you're aware of</p> <p>7 that you agreed to have the stamp used where you</p> <p>8 didn't have to approve it in advance? In other</p> <p>9 words, you knew it would be used and you said,</p> <p>10 that's okay, I don't need to approve those?</p> <p>11 A No.</p> <p>12 (Exhibit No. <u>7</u> was marked.)</p> <p>13 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>14 Q Ms. Randall, you have been handed what's been</p> <p>15 marked for identification as Exhibit <u>7</u> to your</p> <p>16 deposition.</p> <p>17 A Yes.</p> <p>18 Q And this is a document that's titled, "Restated</p> <p>19 Stock Transfer Agreement." Do you see that at</p> <p>20 the top of page 1?</p> <p>21 A Yes, I do.</p> <p>22 Q And the date for this document it says that it's</p> <p>23 made effective December 31, 2012. Do you see</p> <p>24 that?</p> <p>25 A Yes, I do.</p>	<p>1 If you would flip, Ms. Randall, in</p> <p>2 Exhibit <u>7</u> to page 13 of the document?</p> <p>3 A That's my stamp.</p> <p>4 Q That is your stamp?</p> <p>5 A Yup.</p> <p>6 Q And I think I know what you're going to say, but</p> <p>7 tell me why you say that's your stamp.</p> <p>8 A Because it's bold and very dark black.</p> <p>9 Q And to the best of your recollection that's what</p> <p>10 the piece of paper looked like that you</p> <p>11 submitted to have the stamp created?</p> <p>12 A Yes.</p> <p>13 Q Can you go back, if you would, to an exhibit</p> <p>14 that we discussed prior to lunch, Exhibit <u>6</u>,</p> <p>15 it's the second amendment to the shareholder</p> <p>16 agreement, the first page is a consent to</p> <p>17 shareholder agreement page, and then we were</p> <p>18 discussing your signature. So this would be on</p> <p>19 page 3 of the exhibit that I wanted you to turn</p> <p>20 to.</p> <p>21 A Mm-hmm.</p> <p>22 Q So you said before that you were -- that you did</p> <p>23 not believe that -- or at least you weren't</p> <p>24 certain that the signature on page 3 of Exhibit</p> <p>25 <u>6</u> was actually your signature; am I remembering</p>
Page 106	Page 108
<p>1 Q And this document appears to concern a</p> <p>2 transaction between Terry Vial. Do you see</p> <p>3 that?</p> <p>4 A Yes, I do.</p> <p>5 Q Windy Waters and Widen Enterprises. Do you see</p> <p>6 that?</p> <p>7 A Yes.</p> <p>8 Q Do you remember Terry Vial?</p> <p>9 A Yes.</p> <p>10 Q Who is Terry Vial?</p> <p>11 A A very good friend of Reed's.</p> <p>12 Q And was he a shareholder in the company -- or</p> <p>13 Windy Waters at a certain point in time?</p> <p>14 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection.</p> <p>15 Foundation.</p> <p>16 THE WITNESS: I'm not aware of that.</p> <p>17 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>18 Q You don't remember whether Terry Vial ever held</p> <p>19 shares in the company?</p> <p>20 A I don't know if he did.</p> <p>21 Q If -- I will note for the record that this</p> <p>22 document is not Bates labeled, Exhibit <u>7</u>, but I</p> <p>23 do believe it's been produced in the case. And</p> <p>24 we can provide the Bates number if you guys need</p> <p>25 it on the break.</p>	<p>1 your testimony correctly?</p> <p>2 A Yes.</p> <p>3 Q Can you compare the signatures between these two</p> <p>4 documents and tell me whether or not you still</p> <p>5 wonder if it's your signature?</p> <p>6 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection.</p> <p>7 Foundation.</p> <p>8 THE WITNESS: If I still think this is</p> <p>9 my signature or not my signature?</p> <p>10 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>11 Q Yes. Or if you can tell.</p> <p>12 A I can't really tell.</p> <p>13 Q Let's go to Exhibit <u>4</u>, the one that I told you</p> <p>14 you wouldn't need to see again. I didn't really</p> <p>15 say that. You asked me. I'm bringing back</p> <p>16 Exhibit <u>4</u>, and that's the 1992 shareholder</p> <p>17 agreement. Do you have that?</p> <p>18 A Yes.</p> <p>19 Q And do you remember we were looking at page 18?</p> <p>20 A Yes.</p> <p>21 Q Can you go to page 18?</p> <p>22 A Sure.</p> <p>23 Q And you see your signature on that page?</p> <p>24 A I do.</p> <p>25 Q And now comparing the three, it looks like your</p>

Page 109	Page 111
<p>1 signatures are a little different on each 2 document. Do you agree with that? 3 A Yes. 4 Q Is it possible that you sign documents 5 differently at times? 6 A Yes. 7 Q Have you always written out your middle name 8 when you sign documents or do you sometimes not 9 write it out? 10 A Sometimes I don't write it out. 11 Q In your signature that's in the signature stamp 12 for Exhibit <u>7</u>, I'm going to ask you to look at 13 it with me. It looks like you did write out 14 Widen, maybe, but it's super quick or quick? 15 A Yes. 16 Q I don't want to say sloppy because I'm not 17 trying to offend you, but it's quickly written. 18 Do you agree with that? 19 A I don't think it was quick. I don't recall it 20 being quick. I don't know what I was thinking 21 at the time. 22 Q Fair to say that you -- when you signed things 23 sometimes your signature is more legible than 24 other times? 25 A When I changed my signature to this.</p>	<p>1 and Responses to Defendant's First Set of 2 Interrogatories." Do you see that? 3 A Yes. 4 Q And on the last -- we're missing from this 5 version actually your verification, but do you 6 recall reviewing interrogatory responses for 7 purposes of this case to then respond to 8 questions from defendants? 9 A Can you tell me what an interrogatory is? 10 Q Sure. So an interrogatory, I will state for the 11 record, is a written question that you can serve 12 on another party in a case. So you have served 13 interrogatories on defendants and defendants 14 have served interrogatories on you. 15 In this particular example this is a set of 16 questions, the interrogatories, that you have 17 answered. 18 A Yes. 19 Q And your attorneys worked with you, and there's 20 one about the stamp that I just wanted you to 21 look at. 22 A Okay. 23 Q And I believe it is -- it starts on page 7 of 24 Exhibit <u>8</u>, interrogatory number 3. Tell me when 25 you're there.</p>
Page 110	Page 112
<p>1 Q On Exhibit <u>7</u>? 2 A Yeah, the initials. 3 Q Yes. 4 A Was when we started doing real estate in 5 Florida, and there was so many documents that I 6 had to sign that I got tired of doing that. So 7 I just went (noise) and that's been my signature 8 ever since. 9 Q And just for the record when you said "doing 10 that," you got tired of writing it -- 11 A Stacy Widen Randall, writing it all out. 12 Q Okay. And if I can find other examples of the 13 stamp, I will. But you agree the stamp is the 14 version of the signature in Exhibit <u>7</u>? 15 A Yes, I do. 16 MR. CHURCHILL: Okay. Thank you, 17 Ms. Randall. 18 (Exhibit No. <u>8</u> was marked.) 19 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 20 Q Ms. Randall, the court reporter has handed you 21 now what's been marked for identification as 22 Exhibit <u>8</u> -- 23 A Yes. 24 Q -- to your deposition, and this is a document 25 titled, "Plaintiff Stacy L. Randall's Objections</p>	<p>1 A Yes. 2 Q I will just read it out loud. Interrogatory 3 number 3 reads, "Identify and describe your 4 decision to obtain and provide for use by the 5 companies a 'rubber signature stamp' as 6 referenced in paragraphs," and then it lists a 7 number of paragraphs in the Complaint. Do you 8 see that? 9 A Yes. 10 Q And then there's some lawyer speak on bottom of 11 page 7, and then we're going to flip over and 12 look at your answer. It's at the top of page 8. 13 That reads, "Plaintiff purchased a stamp with 14 her signature at the request of Mr. Kiesler." 15 Do you see that? 16 A Yes. 17 Q Is that still correct? 18 A I guess I was assuming -- yes, he's the one that 19 asked me. 20 Q And next line, "Plaintiff moved to Florida from 21 Madison, Wisconsin, in or around 2001. Because 22 plaintiff lived in Florida, Mr. Kiesler or other 23 members of company management would fax or scan 24 documents to plaintiff to sign." Do you see 25 that?</p>

Page 113

1 A Yes.
2 Q And do you recall that prior to using the stamp
3 Mr. Kiesler or other members of company
4 management would fax or scan documents for you
5 to sign?
6 A Yes.
7 Q Are you aware of any instance where Mr. Kiesler
8 or members of management did not send you a
9 document to sign?
10 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Object to the form of
11 the question.
12 THE WITNESS: Can you rephrase that,
13 please?
14 MR. CHURCHILL: Can you read it back?
15 (Last question read back.)
16 MR. CHURCHILL: And I'm speaking
17 specifically in this time frame after you moved to
18 Florida and your interrogatory response says that --
19 Mr. Kiesler or other members of company management
20 would fax or scan documents for you to sign. So what
21 I'm asking is whether you're aware of a situation
22 where something that needed to be signed by you was
23 not faxed or scanned to you?
24 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection to the form
25 of the question.

Page 114

1 THE WITNESS: I wouldn't know because
2 I didn't -- all I know is the ones that they did send
3 me, and by the looks of the stamps I was not aware of
4 those.
5 BY MR. CHURCHILL:
6 Q Okay. But before the stamp was being used,
7 you're not aware of an occasion where something
8 wasn't sent to you that needed to be signed?
9 A I don't know what I don't know, I guess.
10 Q The interrogatory then continues, "Following
11 plaintiff's move, Mr. Kiesler asked plaintiff to
12 get a stamp with her signature in the event a
13 document needed to be signed quickly and
14 plaintiff was unavailable to sign and scan
15 and/or fax the document to Windy Waters." Do
16 you see that?
17 A Yes.
18 Q And does that still reflect your testimony
19 regarding the stamp?
20 A Yes, it does.
21 Q Reading on, "Plaintiff agreed, provided the
22 stamp was used for the limited purposes of
23 signing documents that required a quick
24 turnaround and on the express condition that
25 Mr. Kiesler or another member of Windy Waters'

Page 115

1 leadership notified plaintiff each time they
2 wished to use the signature stamp. Mr. Kiesler
3 agreed to plaintiff's terms." Do you see that
4 as well?
5 A Yes.
6 Q Do you remember the discussion about
7 distinguishing between documents that required a
8 quick turnaround versus documents that did not
9 require a quick turnaround?
10 A It seemed everything that he sent me was quick
11 turnaround.
12 Q But do you remember saying to Mr. Kiesler or
13 anyone else in management that if a document
14 doesn't require a quick turnaround, the stamp is
15 not to be used?
16 A No.
17 Q Do you remember the quick turnaround requirement
18 at all?
19 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Object to the form of
20 the question.
21 THE WITNESS: Like I said, everything
22 that Kiesler sent me seemed to be needed quickly.
23 BY MR. CHURCHILL:
24 Q My understanding of your interrogatory responses
25 is that the stamp was not to be used unless the

Page 116

1 signature required a quick turnaround, was that
2 the case?
3 A I'm not sure.
4 Q Did you go back to Wisconsin at any point for
5 the express purpose of signing documents?
6 A Not that I can remember.
7 Q Did you ever say that if a document that
8 required signing didn't require a quick
9 turnaround that you expected to be able to come
10 back to sign the documents in person?
11 A No.
12 Q Do you remember anything about the quick
13 turnaround requirement other than the fact that
14 documents normally needed to be signed on a
15 quick turnaround basis?
16 A I don't.
17 Q The next statement is, "Following the
18 conversation with Mr. Kiesler, plaintiff went to
19 a Staples in Monona, Wisconsin, and purchased
20 the stamp. Plaintiff then provided the stamp to
21 Mr. Kiesler." Do you see that?
22 A Yes.
23 Q And that's your testimony here today as well?
24 A Yes.
25 Q After the stamp was acquired and we're not sure

Page 117

1 exactly when, but sometime after 2001, do you
2 remember occasions when Mike would reach out to
3 you to ask you if the stamp could be used?
4 A Just one time and that was in December of '19,
5 maybe.
6 Q Is it possible that Mike did reach out to you to
7 ask your permission to use the stamp on other
8 occasions and you had forgotten?
9 A That's possible.
10 Q You may have already answered this, Ms. Randall,
11 but remember we just looked at Exhibit 7 --
12 A Yes.
13 Q -- which had the example of the stamp?
14 A Yes.
15 Q Do you remember signing this document involving
16 Terry Vial and the companies that has your
17 signature stamp that's dated December 31, 2012?
18 A I did not sign that.
19 Q My mistake. Do you remember agreeing to have
20 the stamp used?
21 A No.
22 Q Is it possible that you agreed to have the stamp
23 used and you don't remember?
24 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for
25 speculation.

Page 118

1 THE WITNESS: Anything is possible.
2 So, yes, maybe I don't remember, but --
3 BY MR. CHURCHILL:
4 Q Do you remember every occasion that your stamp
5 was used in 2012?
6 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for
7 speculation. Foundation.
8 THE WITNESS: No.
9 BY MR. CHURCHILL:
10 Q Is it your testimony in this case that other
11 than the time that you remember your stamp being
12 used, which you said was sometime in late 2019,
13 that that use of your stamp was without your
14 approval?
15 A Can you repeat that, please?
16 MR. CHURCHILL: Can you read it back,
17 please?
18 (Last question read back.)
19 THE WITNESS: The use of my stamp
20 was -- I don't recall any phone call or text or email
21 other than that one in December of '21.
22 BY MR. CHURCHILL:
23 Q So this takes me back to the same question. I
24 want to make sure you can answer it if you can.
25 So is it your position then that for all

Page 119

1 the other occasions where the stamp may have
2 been used but you don't remember that that use
3 was without your approval?
4 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection.
5 Speculation.
6 THE WITNESS: Yeah. It was a long
7 time ago. Possible. I can't answer that for sure.
8 BY MR. CHURCHILL:
9 Q If you did give your approval to use the stamp,
10 you agree that it could be used?
11 A The one time, yes.
12 Q Let's say on any time that you gave your
13 approval, if it's shown that you gave your
14 approval and you just have forgotten, you agree
15 the stamp could be used, correct?
16 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection calls for
17 speculation.
18 THE WITNESS: I don't recall ever
19 giving permission to use my stamp.
20 BY MR. CHURCHILL:
21 Q And I understand that. What I'm asking is
22 slightly different. Let's assume that you did
23 give your approval on another occasion, pick a
24 date, 2015. Do you agree that if on that
25 occasion you gave your approval to Mike Kiesler

Page 120

1 or to Reed or to whomever, if you gave approval
2 to use it, do you agree that that was a proper
3 use of the stamp?
4 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection calls for
5 speculation. Foundation.
6 THE WITNESS: I didn't assume
7 anything. So I would have to say no.
8 BY MR. CHURCHILL:
9 Q Tell me again the conditions on which you were
10 going to allow the use of your stamp. From the
11 moment that it was created the conditions were
12 what?
13 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Asked and
14 answered.
15 THE WITNESS: The conditions were that
16 I needed to know when they were using my stamp.
17 BY MR. CHURCHILL:
18 Q And were there further conditions in terms of
19 how you needed to know?
20 A No.
21 Q So let's assume that there was an occasion other
22 than late 2019 where you were told in advance
23 that they wanted to use your stamp, and you
24 said, yes, would that be an approved use of your
25 stamp?

Page 121	Page 123
<p>1 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for 2 speculation. 3 THE WITNESS: I don't ever recall 4 anything -- them ever calling and asking except for 5 that one time. 6 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 7 Q I understand that. And at the risk of incurring 8 another objection from your counsel, I'm asking 9 you to assume -- it's a hypothetical. So by 10 assuming and as a hypothetical it doesn't mean 11 it actually happened. It's a hypothetical. 12 Just like I can assume that I'm Donald Trump, 13 and I'm sitting in the room. 14 Assume that you actually did agree to 15 the use of your stamp in a conversation with 16 Mike Kiesler. If it was then used, would that 17 have been okay? 18 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for 19 speculation. 20 THE WITNESS: I don't know what I 21 would have done at the time. 22 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 23 Q So if you approved use of the stamp, you would 24 then have been upset or disagreed if the stamp 25 was used?</p>	<p>1 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 2 Q It's important to you, right, to know whether or 3 not your signature was being validity used, do 4 you agree with that? 5 A Yes. 6 Q And you agree that the stamp when approved by 7 you substituted for your signature, correct? 8 A Yes. 9 Q You understand that your signature is a 10 significant thing, in other words, that the 11 signing of a document has legal consequences. 12 Do you agree with that? 13 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for 14 a legal conclusion. 15 THE WITNESS: Can you give me a for 16 instance? 17 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 18 Q Well, if you sign a document, does that have 19 significance to you? 20 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Same objections. 21 Calls for speculation. 22 THE WITNESS: Yes. 23 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 24 Q Okay. And what do you understand it to mean if 25 you decide to sign a document?</p>
Page 122	Page 124
<p>1 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. 2 Mischaracterizes her testimony. Calls for 3 speculation. 4 THE WITNESS: The only reason they 5 were allowed to use my stamp was if I knew about it. 6 There's not much more to say. 7 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 8 Q Not only if you knew about it, right, but if you 9 had agreed? 10 A Yes. 11 Q Not just if you knew? 12 A Knew and I agreed. 13 Q So if you knew and agreed, would it have been 14 okay to use the stamp? 15 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Same objections. 16 THE WITNESS: I don't know what I 17 would have done in that situation. 18 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 19 Q So is it your testimony that if you had known 20 about use of the stamp and agreed to its use 21 that you may have protested if it was used? 22 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for 23 speculation. Mischaracterizes her testimony. 24 THE WITNESS: I can't say that for 25 sure.</p>	<p>1 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Same objections. 2 THE WITNESS: It depends on what kind 3 of a document it is. 4 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 5 Q Let's say that it's the shareholder agreement 6 and you signed it. Isn't signing an agreement 7 in your mind what you're thinking when you sign 8 something, doesn't that mean that you are 9 agreeing to the contents of the document? 10 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Object to form. 11 Mischaracterizes her testimony. Also calls for a 12 legal conclusion. 13 THE WITNESS: I would have to talk to 14 my lawyers. 15 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 16 Q I'm not asking what your lawyer thinks. I'm 17 asking what you think. 18 A I don't know what I think, and I probably would 19 need an explanation from my lawyers. 20 MR. CHURCHILL: Okay. So can you read 21 my question back, please? 22 (Last question read back.) 23 MS. POLAKOWSKI: And I will restate my 24 objections. 25 THE WITNESS: Regarding the</p>

Page 125	Page 127
<p>1 stockholders agreement, I believe that was one that</p> <p>2 my dad had us sign. I didn't know what I was</p> <p>3 signing.</p> <p>4 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>5 Q Okay. So I'm trying --</p> <p>6 A I didn't understand what I was signing.</p> <p>7 Q I heard your testimony. So I'm trying to be</p> <p>8 more basic. I will be as basic as I can because</p> <p>9 I'm not trying to trick you. I'm trying to</p> <p>10 understand what you are thinking when you sign</p> <p>11 something.</p> <p>12 If you sign a document that's like an</p> <p>13 agreement, what does your signature mean to</p> <p>14 you -- not to your attorney -- what does your</p> <p>15 signature mean to you when you sign it?</p> <p>16 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for</p> <p>17 a legal conclusion. Also calls for speculation.</p> <p>18 Incomplete hypothetical.</p> <p>19 THE WITNESS: Like a check or</p> <p>20 something like that is a document.</p> <p>21 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>22 Q Okay. What does it mean to you when you sign a</p> <p>23 check to you?</p> <p>24 A That I just paid a bill, and it's my proof.</p> <p>25 Q So you're agreeing -- in the case of a check do</p>	<p>1 Q That's what you were told by who?</p> <p>2 A Mike Kiesler.</p> <p>3 Q What do you mean?</p> <p>4 A Well, he could -- I guess I told him if I knew</p> <p>5 about it and I understood it, he could use my</p> <p>6 signature. I can't assume that I would or not</p> <p>7 because I don't remember them ever asking me.</p> <p>8 Q Okay. So then back to my earlier question. If</p> <p>9 there was an occasion when you approved the use</p> <p>10 of the stamp and you remember one, right, late</p> <p>11 2019, if there was an occasion where you</p> <p>12 approved the use of the stamp, you agree that</p> <p>13 the stamp could be used for your signature?</p> <p>14 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for</p> <p>15 speculation. Legal conclusion.</p> <p>16 THE WITNESS: That day was not a good</p> <p>17 day for me, and I do recall them, Reed and Mike</p> <p>18 Kiesler trying to call me numerous times, and I was</p> <p>19 just getting irritated with them. And when Mike</p> <p>20 Kiesler first asked me, I told him, no, you could not</p> <p>21 use it.</p> <p>22 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>23 Q I know exactly -- I'm going to try one more time</p> <p>24 and -- I'm going to try one more time. I'm not</p> <p>25 talking about that situation yet. I'm going to</p>
Page 126	Page 128
<p>1 you agree that if you write a check, you're</p> <p>2 agreeing that this is money that can be taken</p> <p>3 from your account to pay for something?</p> <p>4 A Yes.</p> <p>5 Q Okay. So if you agreed to have the stamp used</p> <p>6 in a certain circumstance, right, let's say that</p> <p>7 you agreed, you approved of its use and you</p> <p>8 agreed that the stamp could be used, are you</p> <p>9 then agreeing that your stamp has the same power</p> <p>10 as your handwritten signature?</p> <p>11 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for</p> <p>12 a legal conclusion. Calls for speculation.</p> <p>13 THE WITNESS: If I knew about it and I</p> <p>14 understood it, my stamp could be used.</p> <p>15 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>16 Q Okay. And if you had approved the use of your</p> <p>17 stamp, then you agree that that use could be</p> <p>18 relied on, like your stamp was something that</p> <p>19 could be used and could be relied on if you</p> <p>20 agreed to have it used?</p> <p>21 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for</p> <p>22 a legal conclusion.</p> <p>23 THE WITNESS: I was under -- that's</p> <p>24 what I was told.</p> <p>25 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p>	<p>1 get to it and show you documents so that you're</p> <p>2 comfortable with that situation. Because I</p> <p>3 think I know the time you're talking about in</p> <p>4 late 2019.</p> <p>5 Just more generally, Ms. Randall, if</p> <p>6 you -- hypothetically, I'm not saying you</p> <p>7 remember an occasion, but hypothetically if you</p> <p>8 gave approval to use the stamp, right, you knew</p> <p>9 about it ahead of time and you gave approval,</p> <p>10 then you agree that the stamp could be used,</p> <p>11 correct?</p> <p>12 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for</p> <p>13 a legal conclusion. Speculation.</p> <p>14 THE WITNESS: I don't know whether I</p> <p>15 agree or not.</p> <p>16 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>17 Q Was there something else required besides your</p> <p>18 approval?</p> <p>19 A Me understanding what the document said.</p> <p>20 Q So was a condition of using the stamp you also</p> <p>21 saying to someone I know what the document is,</p> <p>22 and I understand the document?</p> <p>23 A That was not said. That was just in my mind. I</p> <p>24 did not say it, per se.</p> <p>25 Q Do you remember an occasion where you were</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 129</p> <p>1 prevented from looking at a document that</p> <p>2 required your signature?</p> <p>3 A Yes.</p> <p>4 Q What occasion is that?</p> <p>5 A These ones from my dad.</p> <p>6 Q Well, if I understood your testimony earlier,</p> <p>7 you said you only remembered seeing the</p> <p>8 signature page. You didn't say somebody</p> <p>9 prevented you from seeing the document.</p> <p>10 A Well, he prevented me from seeing the document.</p> <p>11 Q Did you ask to see the document?</p> <p>12 A No. It was my dad, no.</p> <p>13 Q So how did your dad prevent you from looking at</p> <p>14 the document before you signed it?</p> <p>15 A He did not give it to me.</p> <p>16 Q Did you ask?</p> <p>17 A I did not ask, and I would not ask.</p> <p>18 Q But you could have asked?</p> <p>19 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for</p> <p>20 speculation.</p> <p>21 THE WITNESS: I don't feel I could</p> <p>22 have asked.</p> <p>23 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>24 Q Why don't you feel you could have asked?</p> <p>25 A Because he was mean and scary.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 131</p> <p>1 yeah, let me finish my question before you</p> <p>2 object and before you answer.</p> <p>3 It's possible, right, if you had asked</p> <p>4 your father to review the document that he would</p> <p>5 have said yes?</p> <p>6 MS. POLAKOWSKI: I will object. Calls</p> <p>7 for speculation. Also asked and answered.</p> <p>8 THE WITNESS: I don't know what my dad</p> <p>9 would have said.</p> <p>10 (Exhibit No. 9 was marked.)</p> <p>11 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>12 Q Ms. Randall, you have been handed what's been</p> <p>13 marked as Exhibit 9 for identification, and this</p> <p>14 is a -- it's a four-page printout of a string of</p> <p>15 emails. You can take a moment to review that.</p> <p>16 I think this is the late 2019 exchange that you</p> <p>17 were talking about.</p> <p>18 A There's no print or anything.</p> <p>19 Q So let's go to the first page. At the very top</p> <p>20 do you see where the date is Thursday, December</p> <p>21 26th, 2019, at 3:05 p.m.?</p> <p>22 A Yes.</p> <p>23 Q And this is from Mike Kiesler to you, correct?</p> <p>24 A Yes.</p> <p>25 Q And I believe the chat means that this is a text</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 130</p> <p>1 Q So on occasions when you had to sign a document</p> <p>2 -- strike that.</p> <p>3 Your father being mean and scary</p> <p>4 prevented you from asking to review a document,</p> <p>5 or you think that that's what happened?</p> <p>6 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection to the</p> <p>7 extent it mischaracterizes her testimony.</p> <p>8 THE WITNESS: I know that I wouldn't</p> <p>9 have asked my dad to see the document.</p> <p>10 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>11 Q Do you know that your father would have said no</p> <p>12 if you had asked?</p> <p>13 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for</p> <p>14 speculation.</p> <p>15 THE WITNESS: I don't know what my dad</p> <p>16 thought.</p> <p>17 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>18 Q So your dad might have shown you the document if</p> <p>19 you asked to see the document --</p> <p>20 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Same objection.</p> <p>21 MR. CHURCHILL: -- isn't that true?</p> <p>22 THE WITNESS: I don't know what my dad</p> <p>23 would have thought.</p> <p>24 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>25 Q It's possible that your dad would have said --</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 132</p> <p>1 exchange?</p> <p>2 A Possible.</p> <p>3 Q It looks like Mike's cell phone is listed there</p> <p>4 under the from, 608-212-7825. Do you see that?</p> <p>5 A Yes.</p> <p>6 Q And Mike says, "Hi, Stacy, hope you had a</p> <p>7 wonderful Christmas" -- and I assume that square</p> <p>8 used to be some type of emoji -- "and are</p> <p>9 enjoying the warm temps. Is it okay that I use</p> <p>10 your signature stamp on the consent resolution</p> <p>11 for the buy back of the children's trust</p> <p>12 shares." Do you see that?</p> <p>13 A Yes.</p> <p>14 Q And is this the exchange you were talking about</p> <p>15 before in late 2019 where someone asked for your</p> <p>16 approval to use the stamp?</p> <p>17 A Yes.</p> <p>18 Q Do you remember that particular request from</p> <p>19 Mike or just now remember it because you see the</p> <p>20 document?</p> <p>21 A I remember that Reed and Mike were trying to get</p> <p>22 ahold of me all day, and I wasn't answering</p> <p>23 their calls.</p> <p>24 Q If you flip -- go ahead.</p> <p>25 A And I believe I said, no, when I finally did</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 133</p> <p>1 answer it.</p> <p>2 Q So if you flip to page 2, there's a response</p> <p>3 from you. It looks like at 4:15 p.m. Do you</p> <p>4 see that?</p> <p>5 A Mm-hmm.</p> <p>6 Q And you said, "No," correct?</p> <p>7 A Mm-hmm.</p> <p>8 Q It looks like the next response, if you go to</p> <p>9 the next page, Mike two minutes later texts back</p> <p>10 and says, "Are you just kidding?" Do you see</p> <p>11 that?</p> <p>12 A Yup.</p> <p>13 Q And then shortly after you responded at 4:18</p> <p>14 p.m. you texted back and said, "No, I am not</p> <p>15 kidding. I cannot talk right now. I'm under</p> <p>16 some extreme pressure right now. This will have</p> <p>17 to wait." Do you see that?</p> <p>18 A Mm-hmm.</p> <p>19 MS. POLAKOWSKI: That's a "yes,"</p> <p>20 Stacy?</p> <p>21 THE WITNESS: Yes.</p> <p>22 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>23 Q Do you remember what your extreme pressure was</p> <p>24 at the time?</p> <p>25 A Yes.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 135</p> <p>1 for the buy back of the children's trust shares?</p> <p>2 A No, I did not.</p> <p>3 Q Do you recall whether your brother Reed had</p> <p>4 reached out to you earlier that day on this</p> <p>5 issue?</p> <p>6 A I believe he did.</p> <p>7 Q You have been handed what's been marked for</p> <p>8 identification as Exhibit <u>10</u> to your deposition.</p> <p>9 And this looks like it's a colored picture of a</p> <p>10 screenshot from your phone. Do you agree with</p> <p>11 that?</p> <p>12 A Yes.</p> <p>13 Q That is your phone, right?</p> <p>14 A I'm not sure because it says "Reed Widen" at the</p> <p>15 top. Maybe it's his phone.</p> <p>16 Q This was produced by you. Do you see the Bates</p> <p>17 number on the bottom is Randall390? And if I</p> <p>18 understand it correctly, your brother Reed's</p> <p>19 communication in this text string are on the</p> <p>20 left-hand side of the phone and your responses</p> <p>21 are on the right-hand side. Do you agree with</p> <p>22 that?</p> <p>23 A Well, his are black and mine is green.</p> <p>24 Q So his black ones are leaning to the left and</p> <p>25 your green ones are leaning to the right?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 134</p> <p>1 Q What was it?</p> <p>2 A I can't -- I really would rather not talk about</p> <p>3 it.</p> <p>4 Q Okay.</p> <p>5 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Stacy, do you need to</p> <p>6 take a break?</p> <p>7 MR. CHURCHILL: Do you need a break?</p> <p>8 THE WITNESS: Yes. Can I for a few</p> <p>9 minutes?</p> <p>10 MR. CHURCHILL: Yes.</p> <p>11 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We will go off the</p> <p>12 record. The time is 1:24 p.m.</p> <p>13 (Brief recess taken.)</p> <p>14 (Exhibit No. <u>10</u> was marked.)</p> <p>15 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the</p> <p>16 record. The time is 1:39 p.m.</p> <p>17 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>18 Q Okay. Ms. Randall, I wanted to go back and talk</p> <p>19 about Exhibit <u>9</u> again. That was the email or</p> <p>20 the text exchange between you and Mike. Do you</p> <p>21 have that?</p> <p>22 A Yes, I do.</p> <p>23 Q At the time that you were texting with</p> <p>24 Mr. Kiesler in late December 2019, did you know</p> <p>25 what his reference was to the consent resolution</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 136</p> <p>1 A Correct.</p> <p>2 Q So it looks like on December 26th, 2019, at 9:21</p> <p>3 a.m., which would have been the same morning</p> <p>4 that Mike texted you, Reed wrote and said, "Can</p> <p>5 you talk to Mike Kiesler? We need your</p> <p>6 signature." Do you see that?</p> <p>7 A Yes.</p> <p>8 Q Is that the communication that you were</p> <p>9 remembering that he made on this issue earlier</p> <p>10 in the day?</p> <p>11 A Yes.</p> <p>12 Q Did he talk to you by telephone as well?</p> <p>13 A I cannot remember.</p> <p>14 Q Is this the type of communication that you would</p> <p>15 get from Reed from time to time regarding a need</p> <p>16 to get your signature?</p> <p>17 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Form.</p> <p>18 Vague.</p> <p>19 THE WITNESS: I normally didn't get</p> <p>20 things from Reed for signature.</p> <p>21 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>22 Q Do you recall another time that Reed texted you</p> <p>23 asking you for your signature on something other</p> <p>24 than Exhibit <u>10</u>?</p> <p>25 A I do not recall that.</p>

Page 137	Page 139
<p>1 Q And then I'm going to combine the two documents 2 for purposes of giving a time chronology here. 3 So it looks like after you responded to Mike at 4 4:15 p.m., that was part of Exhibit 2, when you 5 said, no, you then responded to your brother 6 Reed and said, "Sorry, I can't talk right now." 7 Do you see that? 8 A Yes. 9 Q And I don't think we know the exact time frame 10 of his responses, but he responds after you and 11 says, "Call me soon." Do you see that? 12 A Yes. 13 Q "Can you talk," and then he says, "Call me, 14 please. I have only tomorrow left to get your 15 signature." Do you see that? 16 A Yes. 17 Q You agree that your brother was trying to get 18 your signature for purposes of signing some 19 documents, correct? 20 A Yes. 21 Q And you agree that Mike Kiesler was trying to 22 get your signature and asking for your 23 signature? 24 A Yes. 25 Q And then at 6:01 p.m. still December 26th your</p>	<p>1 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 2 Q Do you understand my question? 3 A No. 4 Q You originally said no, correct? 5 A Right. 6 Q And was that a personal reason as opposed to a 7 business reason related to Widen Enterprises or 8 Windy Waters? 9 A I think it may have been a little bit of both. 10 Q Were you -- I didn't want to ask you why you 11 were upset, but now I'm going to have to ask 12 you. What was the reason that you were upset? 13 A I don't want to talk about it. 14 Q If it's a business related reason to the request 15 for signature, I'm going to have to ask you to 16 respond. If it's not related to the request for 17 signature at all, then I don't need to pry and 18 we don't need to know. But understand that if 19 it's related at all to your saying no to the 20 request for the signature, like if you had a 21 reason that should have prevented them from 22 using your signature, I need to ask you to 23 provide that reason, please. 24 A I didn't know what they needed my signature for. 25 Q Okay.</p>
Page 138	Page 140
<p>1 brother Reed says, "Are you okay? Can I help 2 you somehow?" Do you see that? 3 A I do. 4 Q And then it doesn't look like you texted back in 5 this thread because the next communication is 6 from March the 3rd, 2020. Do you agree with 7 that? 8 A Yes. 9 Q Do you recall if you called your brother on the 10 phone in response to his question about whether 11 you were okay and can I help you somehow? 12 A I don't know for sure who called who, if I 13 called him or he called me. 14 Q But you did speak to him about what was 15 troubling you? 16 A No. I did not. 17 Q Did you ultimately give your consent that was 18 being requested on December 26th that you 19 originally said no to? 20 A Yes, I did. 21 Q And was there a business related reason to you 22 initially saying no to the request to use your 23 signature stamp? 24 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Form. 25 Vague.</p>	<p>1 A They were just asking for my signature. 2 Q Okay. 3 A And I wasn't -- I don't feel I was in my right 4 state of mind to be signing documents or giving 5 a signature. 6 Q And why do you say that? 7 A Because I was extremely -- it was an extremely 8 bad day for me. 9 Q Okay. Did the badness of the day have to do at 10 all with the business of the company? 11 A No. 12 Q Okay. And that's what I meant when I was asking 13 before about a business related reason. So was 14 the badness of the day a personal reason? 15 A Yes. 16 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Can we just take a -- 17 MR. CHURCHILL: Sure. 18 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 19 Q Do you need a moment, Ms. Randall? 20 A No, I'm okay. 21 Q You understand why I have to ask you the 22 question, right? You understand why I have to 23 ask you the question? 24 A About why I was so upset that day? 25 Q Just about whether or not it was a business</p>

Page 141	Page 143
<p>1 reason because I just need to know whether or</p> <p>2 not there was a reason related to the actual</p> <p>3 request that caused you to say no. And I think</p> <p>4 you're saying that that's not the case. It was</p> <p>5 a personal issue.</p> <p>6 A I didn't know why they needed my signature.</p> <p>7 They were pressuring me for my signature, and I</p> <p>8 didn't know why, and I wanted to know why.</p> <p>9 Q But Mike Kiesler was offering to tell you why,</p> <p>10 correct?</p> <p>11 A I never talked to Mike.</p> <p>12 Q When you ultimately gave your consent to use the</p> <p>13 signature stamp, did you do that by telephone or</p> <p>14 by text?</p> <p>15 A I don't remember. I don't remember.</p> <p>16 Q Do you remember asking any questions about what</p> <p>17 the use of the signature stamp was for other</p> <p>18 than the issue that Mike raised in Exhibit 9</p> <p>19 concerning the consent resolution for the buy</p> <p>20 back of the children's trust shares?</p> <p>21 A I asked no questions.</p> <p>22 Q Did you look at the entire document that your</p> <p>23 stamp was going to be affixed to or attached to?</p> <p>24 A No.</p> <p>25 Q Did you ask for it?</p>	<p>1 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>2 Q Did you know that you were giving your approval?</p> <p>3 A I felt I was being pressured to give my</p> <p>4 approval.</p> <p>5 Q Did you tell anybody that you felt like you were</p> <p>6 being pressured to give your approval?</p> <p>7 A No.</p> <p>8 Q Did -- was there any other communication with</p> <p>9 respect to -- strike that.</p> <p>10 You said you didn't remember how you</p> <p>11 ultimately gave your approval?</p> <p>12 A No.</p> <p>13 Q No, meaning you don't remember?</p> <p>14 A No, I don't remember.</p> <p>15 Q So you don't remember there being any additional</p> <p>16 pressure provided either, correct?</p> <p>17 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection.</p> <p>18 Mischaracterizes her testimony.</p> <p>19 THE WITNESS: I don't remember that.</p> <p>20 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>21 Q Would it be fair to say that you and Reed, your</p> <p>22 brother Reed, have had an up and down</p> <p>23 relationship?</p> <p>24 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Object to form.</p> <p>25 Vague.</p>
Page 142	Page 144
<p>1 A I did not.</p> <p>2 Q Did you understand what was happening through</p> <p>3 that document that your stamp was being applied</p> <p>4 to, in other words, the purpose of the document?</p> <p>5 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Form.</p> <p>6 Calls for a legal conclusion.</p> <p>7 THE WITNESS: I didn't see or read it.</p> <p>8 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>9 Q Did you understand, however, what the actual</p> <p>10 document was intending to do in terms of the</p> <p>11 consent resolution for the buy back of the</p> <p>12 children's trust shares?</p> <p>13 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Same objections.</p> <p>14 THE WITNESS: I did not know that.</p> <p>15 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>16 Q Did you think it was important to review that</p> <p>17 document at the time?</p> <p>18 A At the time, no.</p> <p>19 Q And you knew that providing your consent to use</p> <p>20 the stamp meant that your stamp was a</p> <p>21 substitution for your ink signature, correct?</p> <p>22 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for</p> <p>23 a legal conclusion.</p> <p>24 THE WITNESS: I don't know what I was</p> <p>25 thinking that day.</p>	<p>1 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>2 Q Do you know what I mean by "up and down"?</p> <p>3 A Will you please explain to me what you mean by</p> <p>4 up and down?</p> <p>5 Q Sure. So if I'm asking you about your</p> <p>6 relationship with Reed, would you say that</p> <p>7 sometimes you guys get along well and sometimes</p> <p>8 you don't get along well?</p> <p>9 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Form. Is</p> <p>10 there a time frame you're asking about?</p> <p>11 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>12 Q How about let's do your entire relationship with</p> <p>13 Reed to start and then we can narrow it down.</p> <p>14 Would you say that sometimes you guys have</p> <p>15 gotten along well and sometimes you haven't?</p> <p>16 A Yes.</p> <p>17 Q Would you agree that on occasion Reed has looked</p> <p>18 out for you?</p> <p>19 A No.</p> <p>20 Q How did you take his comment in Exhibit 10 at</p> <p>21 6:01 p.m. where he says, "Are you okay? Can I</p> <p>22 help you somehow?" How did you take that or how</p> <p>23 did you interpret that?</p> <p>24 A I don't remember.</p> <p>25 Q Are you saying that Reed was not showing some</p>

Page 145

1 concern about the way you were feeling?
2 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Form.
3 Mischaracterizes her testimony.
4 THE WITNESS: I don't know what Reed
5 was thinking or feeling that day. He's a
6 manipulator.
7 BY MR. CHURCHILL:
8 Q And you don't remember that particular comment
9 anyhow, correct?
10 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Object to form.
11 THE WITNESS: I don't -- I don't
12 remember it.
13 BY MR. CHURCHILL:
14 Q Has Reed not looked out for you over the years
15 by helping you financially?
16 A No, he has not.
17 Q Reed has never helped you out financially?
18 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Form.
19 Mischaracterizes her testimony.
20 THE WITNESS: How do mean financially?
21 BY MR. CHURCHILL:
22 Q When you needed help, has Reed found a way to
23 help you out financially?
24 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Form.
25 Assumes facts not in evidence.

Page 146

1 THE WITNESS: Personally or through
2 business he -- after I asked for some money from my
3 stock, first he would blow up at me because this is
4 ridiculous and we're not a bank and blah, blah, blah,
5 and then he would eventually tell me to talk to
6 Kiesler.
7 BY MR. CHURCHILL:
8 Q And what did you understand him to mean when he
9 said we're not a bank?
10 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for
11 speculation.
12 THE WITNESS: I'm not sure what Reed
13 was thinking when he said that.
14 BY MR. CHURCHILL:
15 Q That's not really what I asked. I'm asking what
16 did you understand him to mean, not what he
17 actually meant. What did you understand his
18 comment to mean? I'm asking for your
19 understanding.
20 A I was thinking that they don't have money to be
21 giving me.
22 Q Did you ever say to him, well, the companies are
23 a bank or something to that effect?
24 A No, I did not say that.
25 Q Did you understand his response -- did that mean

Page 147

1 to you that you felt that he was annoyed with
2 you?
3 A When he was asking, are you okay, can I help
4 you?
5 Q No, the comment about the bank.
6 A Yes.
7 Q Do you feel like you treated the companies like
8 a bank?
9 A No, I did not.
10 Q After the creation of the stamp, were you aware
11 that it was being used from time to time?
12 A No.
13 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Form.
14 Vague.
15 BY MR. CHURCHILL:
16 Q So after its creation, which we don't have
17 pinpointed exactly, but let's just say after its
18 creation until when you ultimately redeemed the
19 rest of your shares in May of 2020, you were not
20 aware that the stamp was being used from time to
21 time?
22 A I was never called, text, or emailed to find out
23 if they could use my stamp. So I did not know
24 that they were using my stamp.
25 Q Regardless of whether you were called or texted,

Page 148

1 did you know it was being used?
2 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Asked and
3 answered.
4 THE WITNESS: No. I did not know it
5 was being used.
6 BY MR. CHURCHILL:
7 Q Did you ever tell anyone after the stamp was
8 created to stop using your stamp?
9 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for
10 speculation.
11 THE WITNESS: I don't believe so.
12 BY MR. CHURCHILL:
13 Q Did you ever suspect that the stamp was being
14 used without your approval after its creation?
15 A I don't think I ever really thought about it.
16 Q Did you ever receive copies of documents that
17 may have had your stamp on it, but you just
18 didn't look at the documents?
19 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for
20 speculation.
21 THE WITNESS: I did not receive
22 documents.
23 BY MR. CHURCHILL:
24 Q You never received any documents?
25 A Not with my stamp on it, no.

Page 149	Page 151
<p>1 Q What kind of documents did you receive?</p> <p>2 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Vague.</p> <p>3 THE WITNESS: I can't think of any.</p> <p>4 Probably nothing else.</p> <p>5 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>6 Q I took from your last answer that maybe you did</p> <p>7 receive documents. So, again, let's pinpoint it</p> <p>8 after the creation of the stamp. Did you ever</p> <p>9 receive documents from the companies either</p> <p>10 Windy Waters or Widen Enterprises?</p> <p>11 A No, not that I can recall.</p> <p>12 Q What about related to your taxes that you had to</p> <p>13 file, did you receive documents related -- from</p> <p>14 the companies related to your taxes that you had</p> <p>15 to file?</p> <p>16 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Object to form.</p> <p>17 THE WITNESS: I think I did.</p> <p>18 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>19 Q And what do you think those were, what documents</p> <p>20 would they have been?</p> <p>21 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Form.</p> <p>22 Calls for speculation.</p> <p>23 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>24 Q Are you thinking of official tax documents like</p> <p>25 your K-1 or something like that, or are you</p>	<p>1 to send it off to my accountant.</p> <p>2 Q But those documents came to you first as far as</p> <p>3 you remember?</p> <p>4 A Yes.</p> <p>5 Q Did you ever review the documents that you got</p> <p>6 before sending them to your accountant?</p> <p>7 A No, I did not.</p> <p>8 Q Do you remember at all what type of documents</p> <p>9 they would be or when you received them?</p> <p>10 A When I received them was random. It was never</p> <p>11 at the same time. I'm not sure what -- I don't</p> <p>12 know what.</p> <p>13 Q Do you remember if you filed taxes at a</p> <p>14 particular time each year?</p> <p>15 A I did not file taxes at a particular time each</p> <p>16 year.</p> <p>17 Q Did you have your own accountant to help you</p> <p>18 with taxes?</p> <p>19 A Yes.</p> <p>20 Q And who would that have been?</p> <p>21 A Scott Spangler. I still haven't filed my taxes</p> <p>22 this year.</p> <p>23 Q When you got documents from the company for</p> <p>24 purposes of taxes, did you then forward them to</p> <p>25 Scott Spangler?</p>
Page 150	Page 152
<p>1 thinking of something different?</p> <p>2 A I got -- I got stuff for the cottage.</p> <p>3 Q What kind of stuff did you get for the cottage?</p> <p>4 A I don't know. I look at it and -- I'm not an</p> <p>5 accountant. I don't know.</p> <p>6 Q And when you say stuff for the cottage, you mean</p> <p>7 the cottage that was part of Milmont, LLC?</p> <p>8 A Yes.</p> <p>9 Q And you understand that Milmont, LLC, is a</p> <p>10 different corporate entity than Windy Waters and</p> <p>11 Widen Enterprises, correct?</p> <p>12 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for</p> <p>13 a legal conclusion.</p> <p>14 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>15 Q Do you understand that?</p> <p>16 A I realize it's a different LLC, yes.</p> <p>17 Q Any other documents that you received</p> <p>18 specifically -- sorry, not any other. I don't</p> <p>19 think we have heard any documents yet. You</p> <p>20 think you may have received some documents from</p> <p>21 Windy Waters or Widen Enterprises. I'm trying</p> <p>22 to figure out if you remember what they may have</p> <p>23 been.</p> <p>24 A I believe I got things from the company for -- I</p> <p>25 don't know, for tax reasons. I just knew I had</p>	<p>1 A I -- I had a folder that I put everything in,</p> <p>2 so, no.</p> <p>3 Q When you say you had a folder, do you mean like</p> <p>4 an electronic folder?</p> <p>5 A No. I do nothing electronically like that. I</p> <p>6 don't know how.</p> <p>7 Q So how did you get the documents to</p> <p>8 Mr. Spangler?</p> <p>9 A I had a folder that I put anything that I</p> <p>10 thought had to do with taxes in this folder, and</p> <p>11 I would take it to him when I got everything.</p> <p>12 Q And is Mr. Spangler still your accountant today?</p> <p>13 A Yes.</p> <p>14 Q Is he located in -- I'm going to mispronounce</p> <p>15 it, Stoughton?</p> <p>16 A Stoughton. It's very Norwegian.</p> <p>17 Q Stoughton.</p> <p>18 A Stoughton.</p> <p>19 Q And is he with H&R Block still?</p> <p>20 A Yes, he is.</p> <p>21 Q And how long has he been your accountant, if you</p> <p>22 remember?</p> <p>23 A Since I came back from Florida. Let me see.</p> <p>24 Probably since '15.</p> <p>25 Q And 2015 is roughly when you moved back from the</p>

Page 153

1 Tampa area?
2 A No. We moved back in '11 or '12. We had an
3 accountant in Florida that we used.
4 Q And who was that?
5 A I don't know his name. My husband took care of
6 all that stuff.
7 Q Do you remember the name of the firm if it was a
8 firm?
9 A He worked out of his house.
10 Q And so you started using Scott Spangler roughly
11 in 2015?
12 A Yes.
13 Q Who did you use in Wisconsin between the time
14 when you moved back and 2015, if anyone?
15 A We used the guy in Florida.
16 Q You still used the person in Florida?
17 A For like three or four years, but it became
18 pretty obvious that he didn't know Wisconsin law
19 and taxes.
20 Q And so did you use the same procedure with the
21 accountant in Florida that you did with
22 Mr. Spangler, you would send hard copies to him
23 in Florida?
24 A My husband took care of all that. I'm not sure
25 what he did.

Page 154

1 Q When you say all of that, that would have
2 included any documents that you had from Windy
3 Waters or Widen Enterprises that you needed to
4 submit for tax purposes, correct?
5 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Object to the extent
6 it calls for speculation.
7 THE WITNESS: Can you repeat that
8 question, please?
9 MR. CHURCHILL: Can you read it back?
10 (Last question read back.)
11 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Also object to the
12 extent it calls for a legal conclusion.
13 THE WITNESS: My husband got the mail.
14 That was like his job. So I don't know what all he
15 sent to the tax accountant. Anything that came in
16 the mail, I guess.
17 BY MR. CHURCHILL:
18 Q Did you understand him to be submitting your
19 documents related to Windy Waters and Widen
20 Enterprises for tax purposes to your accountant?
21 A Yes.
22 Q It was his responsibility to do it?
23 A Yeah. He took care of the taxes, took care of
24 all the money.
25 Q Is there something that would jog your memory on

Page 155

1 the name of that Florida accountant?
2 A I never talked to him. I don't know.
3 Q You never talked to him?
4 A No.
5 Q When you and your husband did your taxes back
6 when you were living in Florida, did you go meet
7 personally with the accountant to review the
8 taxes before signing?
9 A I did not go, but Steve went.
10 Q Didn't you have to sign your return?
11 A I did, but he probably brought it home to me. I
12 don't remember.
13 Q You can put that one to the side. Ms. Randall,
14 can you go back to Exhibit 6 again. That's the
15 second amendment to the shareholder agreement
16 with the consent on the first page. This is the
17 one we were looking at when we were looking at
18 your signature.
19 A Okay.
20 Q So I think I didn't quite finish a couple
21 questions that I had about this one. In part
22 because you didn't remember whether or not you
23 signed this document, correct?
24 A Correct.
25 Q So I take it you don't have a memory of

Page 156

1 reviewing the document?
2 A No, I do not.
3 Q If you signed this document yourself in 2007,
4 would you have reviewed it before signing it?
5 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for
6 speculation.
7 THE WITNESS: I was living in Florida
8 at the time. I don't remember reviewing it.
9 BY MR. CHURCHILL:
10 Q Do you think you would have reviewed it before
11 signing?
12 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Same objection.
13 Asked and answered.
14 THE WITNESS: I probably would have
15 reviewed it, but I -- I wouldn't understand it.
16 BY MR. CHURCHILL:
17 Q Do you recall whether or not you had an attorney
18 look at this document?
19 A I did not have an attorney.
20 Q Would it have been important for you to review
21 it before signing it?
22 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Object to form.
23 Vague.
24 THE WITNESS: What do you mean by
25 "important"?

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 157</p> <p>1 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>2 Q Well, if you were going to sign a document,</p> <p>3 would it be important for you to review it</p> <p>4 before signing it?</p> <p>5 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Same objection.</p> <p>6 THE WITNESS: I would have to say</p> <p>7 that -- I would have to say, no, because I don't --</p> <p>8 so much legal words, and I wouldn't understand it</p> <p>9 anyways. I would need a lawyer.</p> <p>10 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>11 Q Say that last part. I didn't understand.</p> <p>12 A I would need a lawyer.</p> <p>13 Q But you don't remember getting a lawyer for</p> <p>14 purposes of reviewing this document, correct?</p> <p>15 A I did not get a lawyer.</p> <p>16 Q Let me have you look at page 2, again, which is</p> <p>17 the first page of the agreement.</p> <p>18 A Yes.</p> <p>19 Q Again, this document is dated May 7, 2007,</p> <p>20 right?</p> <p>21 A Yes.</p> <p>22 Q And this is the document that has a signature</p> <p>23 for you under president. Do you remember going</p> <p>24 over that before?</p> <p>25 A Yes.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 159</p> <p>1 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection.</p> <p>2 Foundation.</p> <p>3 THE WITNESS: I do not.</p> <p>4 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>5 Q The second paragraph 2, but should have been</p> <p>6 paragraph 3, reads, "The shareholders desire to</p> <p>7 amend the shareholder agreement to adopt such</p> <p>8 formula as the basis for determining the fair</p> <p>9 market value of the stock." Do you see that?</p> <p>10 A Yes.</p> <p>11 Q And there's another document that's included in</p> <p>12 this or attached as a part of this agreement.</p> <p>13 It's an Exhibit C. So if you flip to the page</p> <p>14 after your signature titled Exhibit C, do you</p> <p>15 see that?</p> <p>16 A Yes.</p> <p>17 Q Okay. And that Exhibit C, this is Windy33095</p> <p>18 titled, "Exhibit C Fair Market Value Per Share</p> <p>19 Calculation." Do you see that?</p> <p>20 A Yes.</p> <p>21 Q And then there's a bunch of words and some</p> <p>22 numbers and something referred to the weighted</p> <p>23 average EBITDA. Do you see that as well?</p> <p>24 A Yes.</p> <p>25 Q Have you seen Exhibit C before?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 158</p> <p>1 Q So on the first page of the agreement, which is</p> <p>2 Windy33092, do you see under the recitals there</p> <p>3 are three paragraphs and two number twos for</p> <p>4 some reason?</p> <p>5 A Yes, I do see that.</p> <p>6 Q I think we call that a typo. So that probably</p> <p>7 should have been a 3. Let me go through those</p> <p>8 recitals with you.</p> <p>9 So the first paragraph reads, "The</p> <p>10 shareholders entered into a shareholder</p> <p>11 agreement under the name of Widen</p> <p>12 Colourgraphics, LTD, as of March 1, 1992, which</p> <p>13 agreement was made applicable to the corporation</p> <p>14 with an amendment of shareholders agreement</p> <p>15 dated effective September 12, 2001." And then</p> <p>16 it says, "together, the shareholder agreement."</p> <p>17 Do you see that?</p> <p>18 A Yes.</p> <p>19 Q And then under paragraph 2 it states, "The</p> <p>20 corporation has established a formula for the</p> <p>21 determination of the fair market value of the</p> <p>22 stock that it has used for previous stock</p> <p>23 transactions." Do you see that?</p> <p>24 A Yes.</p> <p>25 Q And do you know what that's a reference to?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 160</p> <p>1 A I don't believe so. I don't recall.</p> <p>2 Q If you signed this agreement in 2007, would you</p> <p>3 have reviewed the exhibits that were attached to</p> <p>4 the agreement?</p> <p>5 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for</p> <p>6 speculation. Assumes facts not in evidence.</p> <p>7 THE WITNESS: I don't think that I saw</p> <p>8 this.</p> <p>9 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>10 Q Do you remember generally at this time in 2007 a</p> <p>11 discussion about amending the shareholder</p> <p>12 agreement?</p> <p>13 A I don't remember anything about that.</p> <p>14 Q Do you remember anything about amending the</p> <p>15 shareholder agreement to formalize a formula?</p> <p>16 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Vague as</p> <p>17 to timing.</p> <p>18 THE WITNESS: I don't remember. I</p> <p>19 wasn't told about most of this stuff.</p> <p>20 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>21 Q You agree that if you did sign the 2007</p> <p>22 agreement, that you would have been agreeing to</p> <p>23 the statements in the agreement, correct?</p> <p>24 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for</p> <p>25 a legal conclusion. Calls for speculation.</p>

Page 161	Page 163
<p>1 THE WITNESS: I wouldn't understand 2 all this. I don't know whatever it is EBITDA. 3 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 4 Q But would you have understood if you signed that 5 you were agreeing to the contents of the 6 agreement even if you didn't understand it 7 yourself? 8 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Same objections. 9 Legal conclusion. Calls for speculation. 10 THE WITNESS: I don't know. 11 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 12 Q The reference in the recitals to this first 13 paragraph 2, the fact that, "The corporation has 14 established a formula for the determination of 15 the fair market value of the stock that it has 16 used for previous stock transactions." That's a 17 reference to one of your prior stock 18 redemptions; isn't it? 19 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for 20 speculation. Calls for a legal conclusion. 21 THE WITNESS: I have no idea what it's 22 in reference to. 23 MR. CHURCHILL: Hold that off to the 24 side, not too far because we might need to look at it 25 again, and I'm going to give you a new document.</p>	<p>1 Q -- do you see your signature? 2 A Yes. 3 Q It looks like another version of your signature? 4 A That's my signature. 5 Q This is the one you were using at the time? 6 A I don't know. 7 Q You don't have any reason to believe that 8 somebody else signed this for you? 9 A That looks like my signature. 10 Q And do you remember getting \$200,000 by 11 redeeming some shares in Windy Waters in 12 September time frame of 2005? 13 A I don't remember when I got it. I remember that 14 I got it. 15 Q You do remember getting \$200,000? 16 A I don't specifically remember the amount. 17 Q Do you remember -- I'm sorry. Go ahead. 18 A There were several amounts of money that I got 19 different amounts. I don't recall when or how 20 much. 21 Q So let me -- I'm going to try to get you to 22 remember what was happening in your life back in 23 '05. So do you remember needing money? 24 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Object to form. 25 Vague.</p>
Page 162	Page 164
<p>1 (Exhibit No. <u>11</u> was marked.) 2 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 3 Q Ms. Randall, you have been handed what's been 4 marked as Exhibit <u>11</u> for identification. Take a 5 look, and then I want to ask you a few questions 6 about it. 7 A Okay. 8 Q And for the record, this is a document labeled 9 Windy688 through 692. Ms. Randall, this 10 document is titled, "Stock Redemption 11 Agreement." Do you see that on the first page? 12 A Yes, I do. 13 Q And the date listed is September 2, 2005, with 14 an effective date of January 30, 2005. Do you 15 see that? 16 A Yes, I do. 17 Q And this is a written agreement between Windy 18 Waters, Inc., and Stacy Randall, correct? 19 A It looks like that, yes. 20 Q And do you have a recollection of signing this 21 document? 22 A No, I do not. 23 Q If you look at page 3 of the exhibit, which is 24 Windy690 -- 25 A Yes.</p>	<p>1 THE WITNESS: Only time I ever asked 2 for money was because I needed it. 3 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 4 Q So do you remember asking for some amount of 5 money from anyone related to the companies in 6 2005? 7 A I can't say when it was. 8 Q Do you remember who you asked? 9 A I probably asked Reed. 10 Q And do you remember anything about the 11 conversation? 12 A "Talk to Kiesler" is what he would always say. 13 Q So he said, "Talk to Kiesler." And did you say, 14 I want to redeem shares in Windy Waters, or did 15 you leave it more open than that? 16 A I said I would like to get some money from my 17 stock. 18 Q For your stock in Windy Waters? 19 A I'm not sure where my stock was from. 20 Q Did Milmont exist at this time? 21 A Yes. 22 Q Did you ask for money from Milmont, or did you 23 ask for money from Windy Waters? 24 A I asked -- I just asked for stock. 25 Q And you knew then that would mean that you would</p>

Page 165	Page 167
<p>1 sell some of your stock and get money in return?</p> <p>2 A Correct.</p> <p>3 Q And if you look in the recitals in Exhibit No.</p> <p>4 <u>11</u>, you will see in recital A that there is a</p> <p>5 statement of the stock that you then owned. If</p> <p>6 you go on -- go on the first page, Ms. Randall,</p> <p>7 of the exhibit -- I'm looking at recitals</p> <p>8 paragraph A, very first page --</p> <p>9 A Okay.</p> <p>10 Q -- do you see where it says, "Randall is the</p> <p>11 owner of two hundred thirty-two and 75/100</p> <p>12 shares of Class A voting common stock."</p> <p>13 A I see that.</p> <p>14 Q And five thousand six thirty-three and 90.25/100</p> <p>15 shares of Class B nonvoting common stock, do you</p> <p>16 see that as well?</p> <p>17 A Yes, I do.</p> <p>18 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Just so the record is</p> <p>19 clear, I think you said 5,033.</p> <p>20 MR. CHURCHILL: I should have said 63.</p> <p>21 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>22 Q So 5,063.9025. Do you see that?</p> <p>23 A Yes.</p> <p>24 Q Do you remember when we were looking at the</p> <p>25 chart before of your stock ownership, and it had</p>	<p>1 think you reviewed it?</p> <p>2 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Same objection.</p> <p>3 Asked and answered.</p> <p>4 THE WITNESS: I was probably just</p> <p>5 given the signature page.</p> <p>6 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>7 Q Well, you said that was something that your dad</p> <p>8 did. Was that something that other people did</p> <p>9 to you as well?</p> <p>10 A Yes.</p> <p>11 Q Do you know for sure that you were only given</p> <p>12 the signature page or you're speculating?</p> <p>13 A I do not know for sure.</p> <p>14 Q Was it important for you to review a document</p> <p>15 like this?</p> <p>16 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Form.</p> <p>17 Calls for a legal conclusion.</p> <p>18 THE WITNESS: I didn't know the</p> <p>19 importance of -- the importance or unimportance of</p> <p>20 any document.</p> <p>21 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>22 Q Well, in 2007 -- or excuse me, in 2005 you were</p> <p>23 going to get \$200,000 from redeeming shares.</p> <p>24 What I'm asking you is at the time was it</p> <p>25 important to you to review the document before</p>
Page 166	Page 168
<p>1 the columns?</p> <p>2 A Yes.</p> <p>3 Q And do you understand that by entering into this</p> <p>4 agreement you decided to redeem some of your</p> <p>5 Class B nonvoting shares of stock?</p> <p>6 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Form.</p> <p>7 Calls for a legal conclusion.</p> <p>8 THE WITNESS: I did not know that.</p> <p>9 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>10 Q Did you specify what shares you wanted to</p> <p>11 redeem?</p> <p>12 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Form.</p> <p>13 THE WITNESS: I didn't know that I had</p> <p>14 different shares. I didn't have the information to</p> <p>15 specify which share I wanted.</p> <p>16 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>17 Q Did you review this 2005 Stock Redemption</p> <p>18 Agreement before signing it?</p> <p>19 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Form.</p> <p>20 THE WITNESS: I can't specifically</p> <p>21 remember. This --</p> <p>22 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>23 Q You were redeeming --</p> <p>24 A -- long time ago.</p> <p>25 Q You were redeeming shares for \$200,000. Do you</p>	<p>1 signing it?</p> <p>2 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Same objection.</p> <p>3 Calls for a legal conclusion. Vague.</p> <p>4 THE WITNESS: No.</p> <p>5 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>6 Q Why not?</p> <p>7 A I trusted my brother and Mike Kiesler.</p> <p>8 Q So do you have a recollection of reviewing how</p> <p>9 many shares you were redeeming in order to be</p> <p>10 paid \$200,000?</p> <p>11 A No. I don't remember.</p> <p>12 Q Did you understand that there was some type of</p> <p>13 computation involved in order to decide how many</p> <p>14 shares you would redeem in order to be paid</p> <p>15 \$200,000?</p> <p>16 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for</p> <p>17 speculation. Assumes facts not in evidence.</p> <p>18 THE WITNESS: I don't understand the</p> <p>19 question.</p> <p>20 MR. CHURCHILL: Can you read it back?</p> <p>21 (Last question read back.)</p> <p>22 MS. POLAKOWSKI: I will restate my</p> <p>23 objections.</p> <p>24 THE WITNESS: No.</p> <p>25 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p>

Page 169	Page 171
<p>1 Q You knew that there was a value that was being 2 assigned to those shares, correct? 3 A I wasn't aware that there was a value. 4 Q Didn't you understand that you were going to 5 sell back some shares? In other words, you were 6 losing some shares that you had owned in order 7 to get the money? 8 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for 9 a legal conclusion. 10 THE WITNESS: I believe that's 11 probably what I thought. 12 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 13 Q And so, therefore, you knew that there was a 14 value that those shares had, that in order to 15 get a certain price each share had a value. You 16 knew that, didn't you? 17 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. 18 Mischaracterizes her testimony. Assumes facts not in 19 evidence. 20 THE WITNESS: I don't believe I knew 21 that. 22 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 23 Q Did you think at the time that if you sold more 24 of your shares you would get more money? 25 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for</p>	<p>1 speculation. 2 THE WITNESS: I guess I figured that 3 they did because I was getting money by cashing in my 4 stock. 5 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 6 Q Did you wonder what the value that you were 7 being paid was based on? 8 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for 9 speculation. 10 THE WITNESS: No, I did not. 11 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 12 Q Did you ask anyone? 13 A No, I did not. 14 Q Were you happy with the \$200,000 that you 15 received? 16 A I believe I asked for it. So, yes, I was happy. 17 Q And when you say you believe asked for it, do 18 you mean that you asked for a specific sum? 19 A Yes. 20 Q So is it your understanding that you specified 21 the amount and someone else determined how many 22 shares that meant you would redeem? 23 A Yes. 24 Q Do you remember why the amount \$2,000 was chosen 25 by you -- \$200,000 was chosen by you?</p>
Page 170	Page 172
<p>1 speculation. 2 THE WITNESS: I don't know what I 3 thought at that time. 4 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 5 Q Did you think if you sold less of your shares 6 you would get less money? 7 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for 8 speculation. 9 THE WITNESS: I don't know what I was 10 thinking at that time. 11 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 12 Q So it's your testimony that you didn't care what 13 you were being paid for the shares that you were 14 redeeming? 15 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. 16 Mischaracterizes her testimony. 17 THE WITNESS: I did not say that. 18 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 19 Q Did you care? 20 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Form. 21 THE WITNESS: I never thought about 22 it. 23 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 24 Q Did you wonder if your shares had value? 25 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for</p>	<p>1 A I needed money. 2 Q Why 200,000? 3 A That I'm not sure of. 4 Q Do you recall anything about a negotiation with 5 anyone in order to reach this agreement? 6 A No, I don't remember. 7 Q Did you have an attorney representing you? 8 A No. I did not. 9 Q Did the companies have an attorney representing 10 them? 11 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. 12 Foundation. 13 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 14 Q Let me strike that. Did Windy Waters have an 15 attorney representing it? 16 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Same objection. 17 THE WITNESS: I don't know. 18 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 19 Q Did you meet with any attorneys? 20 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Vague. 21 THE WITNESS: No, I did not. 22 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 23 Q Do you remember that you received the \$200,000 24 as a lump sum payment? Do you know what I mean 25 by lump sum?</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 173</p> <p>1 A Yes, I do.</p> <p>2 Q Did you receive the \$200,000 as a lump sum</p> <p>3 payment?</p> <p>4 A I think I did.</p> <p>5 Q And how did you receive that money?</p> <p>6 A In a check.</p> <p>7 Q Handed to you?</p> <p>8 A I was living in Florida at the time. So I'm not</p> <p>9 sure if I was back home or if I was in Florida.</p> <p>10 Q And did you talk with Reed about this</p> <p>11 transaction, if you remember?</p> <p>12 A I just told him that I needed \$200,000, and he</p> <p>13 told me to talk to Kiesler.</p> <p>14 Q Do you remember any other communications with</p> <p>15 Reed about it?</p> <p>16 A No.</p> <p>17 Q Did you say "thank you"?</p> <p>18 A No.</p> <p>19 Q Now that you have had an opportunity to look at</p> <p>20 Exhibit <u>11</u>, Ms. Randall, and you have Exhibit <u>6</u>,</p> <p>21 which is that second amendment to the</p> <p>22 shareholder agreement, right on your right hand,</p> <p>23 do you agree that this is one of the previous</p> <p>24 stock transactions that's referenced in</p> <p>25 paragraph 2 of the recitals of the second</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 175</p> <p>1 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>2 Q So the first page is labeled Windy2954. Take a</p> <p>3 moment to look at that document, please.</p> <p>4 A Okay.</p> <p>5 Q Do you recognize this document, Ms. Randall?</p> <p>6 A I do not.</p> <p>7 Q If you flip to -- well, first of all, just to</p> <p>8 identify the document further it's titled --</p> <p>9 Exhibit <u>12</u> is titled "Stock Redemption</p> <p>10 Agreement," which is just like what Exhibit <u>11</u></p> <p>11 was titled, right, Stock Redemption Agreement.</p> <p>12 But this one is dated August 2, 2007, with an</p> <p>13 effective date of June 30, 2007. Do you see</p> <p>14 that?</p> <p>15 A Yes, I do.</p> <p>16 Q And I'm just going to refer to it as 2007 Stock</p> <p>17 Redemption Agreement to distinguish it from</p> <p>18 2005; is that okay?</p> <p>19 A Yes.</p> <p>20 Q In this 2007 Stock Redemption Agreement you have</p> <p>21 a signature here. Do you see that on page 3?</p> <p>22 A Yes, I do.</p> <p>23 Q And is that your signature?</p> <p>24 A Yes.</p> <p>25 Q It's another slightly different form, I think.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 174</p> <p>1 amendment?</p> <p>2 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for</p> <p>3 legal conclusion. Assumes facts not in evidence.</p> <p>4 THE WITNESS: I don't agree to that</p> <p>5 because I didn't know.</p> <p>6 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>7 Q Because you didn't know what?</p> <p>8 A How they were figuring anything out.</p> <p>9 Q You agree that the 2005 redemption is a stock</p> <p>10 transaction, correct?</p> <p>11 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for</p> <p>12 a legal conclusion.</p> <p>13 THE WITNESS: Well, I asked them if I</p> <p>14 could get \$200,000 from my stock. Yes.</p> <p>15 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>16 Q And it's your stock transaction, right, from</p> <p>17 2005?</p> <p>18 A Yes.</p> <p>19 (Exhibit No. <u>12</u> was marked.)</p> <p>20 MR. CHURCHILL: Ms. Randall, you have</p> <p>21 been handed now by the court reporter what's been</p> <p>22 marked as Exhibit <u>12</u> for identification. My copy</p> <p>23 doesn't have a Bates number on it. What do you have,</p> <p>24 Jess?</p> <p>25 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Windy0002954.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 176</p> <p>1 You have no reason to believe that's not your</p> <p>2 signature?</p> <p>3 A No.</p> <p>4 Q You this time were paid for redeeming some stock</p> <p>5 \$250,000; is that correct? If you look at the</p> <p>6 first page under the second paragraph price and</p> <p>7 terms.</p> <p>8 A It seems like an awful lot that I would have</p> <p>9 asked for.</p> <p>10 Q So you anticipated my next question. Is the</p> <p>11 process similar to what happened the last time,</p> <p>12 the first time in 2005, did you say I need X</p> <p>13 amount of dollars, and then the determination of</p> <p>14 the amount of shares was computed?</p> <p>15 A I can't remember the amount of money that I</p> <p>16 asked for.</p> <p>17 Q Do you have any reason to believe that you did</p> <p>18 not ask for \$250,000?</p> <p>19 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for</p> <p>20 speculation.</p> <p>21 THE WITNESS: I just say that it seems</p> <p>22 like a lot of money for me to have asked for.</p> <p>23 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>24 Q Do you have a memory of this being given to you</p> <p>25 without you asking?</p>

Page 177	Page 179
<p>1 A No.</p> <p>2 Q Is it fair to assume that you asked for \$250,000</p> <p>3 or you're just not sure you needed that much?</p> <p>4 A I'm just not sure that I needed that much.</p> <p>5 Q What was happening in your life at this point in</p> <p>6 time? So this is kind of three quarters of the</p> <p>7 way through '07.</p> <p>8 A My husband was in charge of the money.</p> <p>9 Q Does that mean that he was the one that needed</p> <p>10 the 250,000?</p> <p>11 A Well, he asked me if I could get whatever amount</p> <p>12 of money, and I always said yes.</p> <p>13 Q You have no reason to believe that you didn't</p> <p>14 ask for \$250,000. You just don't remember; is</p> <p>15 that correct?</p> <p>16 A I just don't remember.</p> <p>17 Q Just like that 2005 agreement, if you look under</p> <p>18 recitals, there's a statement again of the</p> <p>19 amount of shares that you owned at the time. Do</p> <p>20 you see that?</p> <p>21 MS. POLAKOWSKI: I'm sorry, are we</p> <p>22 looking at <u>12</u>?</p> <p>23 MR. CHURCHILL: We're looking at <u>12</u>.</p> <p>24 You have got <u>12</u>.</p> <p>25 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p>	<p>1 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Same objection.</p> <p>2 THE WITNESS: That's what they say.</p> <p>3 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>4 Q Do you know what the difference is between a</p> <p>5 voting and a nonvoting stock share?</p> <p>6 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection.</p> <p>7 Foundation. Calls for a legal conclusion.</p> <p>8 THE WITNESS: No. I don't know the</p> <p>9 difference.</p> <p>10 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>11 Q At this time you were still a member of the</p> <p>12 board of directors, correct?</p> <p>13 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Assumes</p> <p>14 facts not in evidence.</p> <p>15 THE WITNESS: I don't know if I was or</p> <p>16 not.</p> <p>17 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>18 Q 2007?</p> <p>19 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Same objection.</p> <p>20 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>21 Q Didn't you state earlier that you were a member</p> <p>22 of the board of directors in 2007?</p> <p>23 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Same objection.</p> <p>24 THE WITNESS: I thought I was.</p> <p>25 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p>
Page 178	Page 180
<p>1 Q I'm having trouble -- my eyes have gotten bad,</p> <p>2 so I can't see.</p> <p>3 A Yeah. I took my contacts out. So I can't</p> <p>4 really see. What did you want to know?</p> <p>5 Q You see under recitals section A there's a</p> <p>6 statement of the amount of shares that you have,</p> <p>7 right? Do you see that?</p> <p>8 A Yes.</p> <p>9 Q And it looks like your Class A shares are</p> <p>10 remaining the same still, do you see that? You</p> <p>11 still have 232.75 shares?</p> <p>12 A Yes.</p> <p>13 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Form.</p> <p>14 THE WITNESS: I see it.</p> <p>15 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>16 Q Do you understand that the Class A shares were</p> <p>17 voting shares as distinguished from nonvoting</p> <p>18 shares?</p> <p>19 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for</p> <p>20 legal conclusion.</p> <p>21 THE WITNESS: No. I had no idea.</p> <p>22 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>23 Q You agree that your voting shares have stayed</p> <p>24 the same, though, from document to document,</p> <p>25 they are still at 232.75 shares?</p>	<p>1 Q Do you think that had anything to do with your</p> <p>2 voting shares?</p> <p>3 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for</p> <p>4 a legal conclusion.</p> <p>5 THE WITNESS: I would have no idea of</p> <p>6 that.</p> <p>7 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>8 Q Did you have an understanding when you obtained</p> <p>9 the price and terms under this 2007 Stock</p> <p>10 Redemption Agreement that your shares were being</p> <p>11 given a certain value?</p> <p>12 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Legal</p> <p>13 conclusion. Assumes facts not in evidence.</p> <p>14 THE WITNESS: I really never thought</p> <p>15 about it. I didn't assume because I really never</p> <p>16 thought about it.</p> <p>17 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>18 Q You knew that some of your shares were being</p> <p>19 redeemed in order to get the money, though,</p> <p>20 correct?</p> <p>21 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Same objections.</p> <p>22 THE WITNESS: Yes, I did.</p> <p>23 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>24 Q When you say you never thought about it, does</p> <p>25 that mean you didn't know that there was a</p>

Page 181

1 value, or you just didn't care what the value
2 was?
3 A I didn't know what the value was.
4 Q That was option C. You knew there was a value.
5 You just didn't know what it was, correct?
6 A Yes.
7 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Mark, we have been
8 going about another hour. At your convenience, can
9 we take a short break?
10 MR. CHURCHILL: If you could just let
11 me finish on this one.
12 BY MR. CHURCHILL:
13 Q Ms. Randall, do you remember anything now that
14 you had a chance to look at it needing the
15 \$250,000?
16 A I do not remember.
17 Q Again, you were paid in a lump sum. You got the
18 money all at once, right?
19 A Yes.
20 Q And you were still in Florida?
21 A Yes.
22 Q Did you get a check again?
23 A Yes.
24 Q Do you remember what you used the money for once
25 you got it?

Page 182

1 A Well, it was usually for taxes or to pay the
2 accountant. Those are the two big ones I can
3 remember.
4 Q Do you remember at all comparing the two
5 agreements at the time in 2007, meaning the 2005
6 agreement and the 2007 agreement?
7 A Do I remember what?
8 Q Do you remember at the time comparing the two
9 agreements that you had signed, the 2005 and the
10 2007 agreement?
11 A I did not compare them because I didn't have
12 these papers.
13 Q So when you signed the 2007 agreement, did you
14 review it?
15 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Object to form.
16 THE WITNESS: I didn't review it. I
17 say I probably skimmed over it.
18 BY MR. CHURCHILL:
19 Q So you believe you had the whole agreement
20 before you signed it, right?
21 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection.
22 Mischaracterizes her testimony.
23 THE WITNESS: I don't remember.
24 BY MR. CHURCHILL:
25 Q Would it have been important for you to review

Page 183

1 it?
2 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Form.
3 Calls for a legal conclusion.
4 THE WITNESS: Probably not because I
5 trusted my brother and Kiesler.
6 BY MR. CHURCHILL:
7 Q But you don't know whether in fact you reviewed
8 the 2007 agreement before you signed it,
9 correct?
10 A I don't believe I had it. So I don't remember
11 reviewing it.
12 Q And when you say you don't believe you have it,
13 that's because you believe you only saw the
14 signature page?
15 A Well, I didn't have it to take home and look at.
16 Q Did you sign it at home?
17 A No.
18 Q Where did you sign it?
19 A This I probably signed at the office.
20 Q Which office?
21 A Widen's.
22 Q So you went to Wisconsin to sign this one?
23 A What was the month? June.
24 Q August of '07. It was effective June 30, it
25 says, but it was entered into in August of '07.

Page 184

1 A I was in Wisconsin.
2 Q So you believe you went into Widen's office to
3 execute this one?
4 A Yes, I do.
5 Q And just one more question before we break. Why
6 do you believe that you didn't review the whole
7 document if you were in the office and there to
8 sign it?
9 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Object to the extent
10 it misstates her testimony. Calls for speculation.
11 THE WITNESS: I don't know.
12 BY MR. CHURCHILL:
13 Q Do you actually -- so I have another follow-up
14 question. Do you actually remember not
15 reviewing the document or you're speculating?
16 A I don't remember reviewing this or skimming it.
17 Q But do you remember not reviewing it? In other
18 words, do you know that you didn't review it, or
19 you just don't remember one way or the other?
20 A I know I did not review it. Mike Kiesler may
21 have told me what it says.
22 Q So when you said skimming it, was that you
23 skimming it or him holding it and --
24 A It was me skimming it.
25 Q So you held the document in your hand?

Page 185	Page 187
<p>1 A Well, I can't remember if I had it.</p> <p>2 Q So how did you skim it?</p> <p>3 A You are assuming that I had it.</p> <p>4 Q You tell me how -- you didn't like my term</p> <p>5 reviewed, I take it.</p> <p>6 A Right.</p> <p>7 Q So how did you look at it? Let's just use look.</p> <p>8 How did you look at it? If you didn't review</p> <p>9 it, what did you do?</p> <p>10 A I don't know that I had this to review or look</p> <p>11 at.</p> <p>12 Q But you also don't know you didn't have it,</p> <p>13 correct?</p> <p>14 A Correct.</p> <p>15 Q And this was a transaction that you wanted to</p> <p>16 enter into, right, you wanted the money?</p> <p>17 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Form.</p> <p>18 Mischaracterizes her testimony. Assumes facts not in</p> <p>19 evidence.</p> <p>20 THE WITNESS: I asked for the money,</p> <p>21 yes.</p> <p>22 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>23 Q So you wanted to enter into a transaction to</p> <p>24 redeem your shares to get \$250,000?</p> <p>25 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Same objections.</p>	<p>1 don't know what the heck you're talking about.</p> <p>2 (Exhibit No. <u>13</u> was marked.)</p> <p>3 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>4 Q So, Ms. Randall, the court reporter has handed</p> <p>5 you what's been marked for identification as</p> <p>6 Exhibit <u>13</u> to your deposition. Would you take a</p> <p>7 moment to review it? Do you recognize this</p> <p>8 document?</p> <p>9 A I do not.</p> <p>10 Q So Exhibit <u>13</u> is another document titled, "Stock</p> <p>11 Redemption Agreement." Do you see that at the</p> <p>12 top?</p> <p>13 A Yes, I do.</p> <p>14 Q And it looks to be in fairly similar form as the</p> <p>15 other Stock Redemption Agreements. Do you agree</p> <p>16 with that kind of general statement?</p> <p>17 A Yes, I do.</p> <p>18 Q And on page 3 you have signed the document or</p> <p>19 maybe it's your signature stamp. I'm interested</p> <p>20 in your conclusion on that one.</p> <p>21 A For sure it's my signature stamp.</p> <p>22 Q Okay. Do you remember asking in early -- well,</p> <p>23 sometime in late 2010 or early 2011 to redeem</p> <p>24 some more shares in Windy Waters?</p> <p>25 A I don't remember asking. If that's what this</p>
Page 186	Page 188
<p>1 THE WITNESS: Well, I needed the</p> <p>2 money, so, yes.</p> <p>3 MR. CHURCHILL: We can break.</p> <p>4 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Off the record at</p> <p>5 2:45 p.m.</p> <p>6 (Brief recess taken.)</p> <p>7 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the</p> <p>8 record. This will mark the beginning of media unit</p> <p>9 number 3 of the video recorded deposition of Stacy</p> <p>10 Randall. Today's date is August 28th, 2023, and the</p> <p>11 time is 3:05 p.m.</p> <p>12 MR. CHURCHILL: So just to state for</p> <p>13 the record, and I should have read Christa's note to</p> <p>14 me at the time, Exhibit <u>7</u> which was that agreement</p> <p>15 between Terry Vial and the companies, that was</p> <p>16 produced as Windy0002150 through 2164. I'm not going</p> <p>17 to ask any more questions about it, but I just wanted</p> <p>18 to provide the Bates numbers.</p> <p>19 MS. POLAKOWSKI: You're not asking her</p> <p>20 to confirm because there's --</p> <p>21 MR. CHURCHILL: Correct. Because the</p> <p>22 version I marked for purposes of your deposition is</p> <p>23 unmarked. I just wanted to track that for everyone.</p> <p>24 Something you truly don't care about, Ms. Randall.</p> <p>25 THE WITNESS: No. I really don't. I</p>	<p>1 says.</p> <p>2 Q Well, let's look at the first page.</p> <p>3 A I am.</p> <p>4 Q Do you see in the middle under price in terms</p> <p>5 that the total redemption price shall be</p> <p>6 \$200,000?</p> <p>7 A Yes, I do.</p> <p>8 Q Do you remember asking to obtain \$200,000 in</p> <p>9 early 2011?</p> <p>10 A I don't remember.</p> <p>11 Q Is it fair to assume that you did ask?</p> <p>12 A Yes.</p> <p>13 Q And so if your stamp was used, is it also fair</p> <p>14 to assume that you approved the use of the stamp</p> <p>15 in order to get the document executed?</p> <p>16 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Object to form.</p> <p>17 Misstates her testimony. Calls for a legal</p> <p>18 conclusion.</p> <p>19 THE WITNESS: I did not okay the use</p> <p>20 of my stamp.</p> <p>21 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>22 Q You did not okay the use of your stamp for</p> <p>23 purposes of getting the \$200,000?</p> <p>24 A I was never asked.</p> <p>25 Q Did you know that a redemption agreement was</p>

Page 189	Page 191
<p>1 being entered into for purposes of obtaining the</p> <p>2 \$200,000?</p> <p>3 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Form.</p> <p>4 THE WITNESS: Can you repeat that</p> <p>5 question?</p> <p>6 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>7 Q Sure. Let me state it differently. Do you now</p> <p>8 recall that you got \$200,000 in 2011?</p> <p>9 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Object to form.</p> <p>10 THE WITNESS: If that's what this</p> <p>11 says. I trust my brother and Mike Kiesler, so, yes.</p> <p>12 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>13 Q You don't remember asking for it, though?</p> <p>14 A No. I do -- I don't know when I asked for all</p> <p>15 these. I honestly don't.</p> <p>16 Q Well, let's -- let's go through them quickly.</p> <p>17 There was one in 2005 for \$200,000, right?</p> <p>18 A Yes.</p> <p>19 Q And then in 2007 there was another one for</p> <p>20 250,000, correct?</p> <p>21 A Yes.</p> <p>22 Q So now in 2011 another \$200,000, right?</p> <p>23 A Correct.</p> <p>24 Q Do you remember why you needed the money?</p> <p>25 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Object to form.</p>	<p>1 Florida?</p> <p>2 A In January I believe I was living in Florida,</p> <p>3 and I believe I was back in Florida on January</p> <p>4 11th.</p> <p>5 Q Do you know whether or not you ever reviewed</p> <p>6 this 2011 Stock Redemption Agreement?</p> <p>7 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Object to form.</p> <p>8 THE WITNESS: Review, no. I did not</p> <p>9 review it.</p> <p>10 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>11 Q Do you know whether you ever looked at it?</p> <p>12 A I probably never looked at it.</p> <p>13 Q Do you know whether it was sent to you in</p> <p>14 advance to review or look at?</p> <p>15 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Object to form.</p> <p>16 Vague as to -- hold on. Vague as to -- I lost my</p> <p>17 train of thought.</p> <p>18 THE WITNESS: Sorry.</p> <p>19 MS. POLAKOWSKI: What was the last</p> <p>20 question?</p> <p>21 (Last question read back.)</p> <p>22 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Vague as to in</p> <p>23 advance of what.</p> <p>24 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>25 Q Do you know whether or not you asked to look at</p>
Page 190	Page 192
<p>1 Vague as to time.</p> <p>2 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>3 Q Let me orient you specifically. Let me specify.</p> <p>4 Do you remember why you needed the money for the</p> <p>5 third redemption, the one in 2011?</p> <p>6 A I think it was probably because he owed taxes,</p> <p>7 property taxes.</p> <p>8 Q Who is "he"?</p> <p>9 A My husband. We. Did I say he? Because he took</p> <p>10 care of all the money, and we had bills to pay.</p> <p>11 Q For the 2007 redemption agreement you said that</p> <p>12 you signed that one in Wisconsin, correct?</p> <p>13 A Yes.</p> <p>14 Q And this 2011 agreement you're saying that that</p> <p>15 is your stamp that's being used, correct?</p> <p>16 A Yes.</p> <p>17 Q Do you remember where you were in 2011 in</p> <p>18 January when this would have been happening?</p> <p>19 Were you in Florida?</p> <p>20 A Yes. Yes. Because we always went back right</p> <p>21 after the first of the year.</p> <p>22 Q Tell me again when you moved back to Wisconsin,</p> <p>23 what year.</p> <p>24 A '11 or '12, I said.</p> <p>25 Q But January of '11 you think you were still in</p>	<p>1 the 2011 Stock Redemption Agreement prior to</p> <p>2 having it executed?</p> <p>3 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection that it</p> <p>4 assumes facts not in evidence.</p> <p>5 THE WITNESS: I did not look at this</p> <p>6 prior.</p> <p>7 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>8 Q And why do you say that? Why do you know that?</p> <p>9 A Because I normally didn't see these papers.</p> <p>10 Q Well, you saw the 2007 one, right?</p> <p>11 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection.</p> <p>12 Mischaracterizes her testimony.</p> <p>13 THE WITNESS: Well, I -- I thought I</p> <p>14 have seen it, but I did not review it nor did I</p> <p>15 review this one.</p> <p>16 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>17 Q With respect to 2007 agreement?</p> <p>18 A Yes.</p> <p>19 Q You said you thought you skimmed it. Is that no</p> <p>20 longer your testimony?</p> <p>21 A I probably skimmed it if they gave it to me.</p> <p>22 Q Do you think you skimmed the 2011 Stock</p> <p>23 Redemption Agreement?</p> <p>24 A I do not.</p> <p>25 Q Tell me what -- because I feel like you're</p>

Page 193	Page 195
<p>1 having a problem with my word review. Tell me 2 what skim means to you. 3 A You're just like looking at it quickly. I'm not 4 one of those speed readers. 5 Q Okay. 6 A So I'm just looking at it quickly looking for 7 keywords. 8 Q And how are you using the word review? Like you 9 agree with me that you're differentiating 10 between review and skim? 11 A Reviewing and skimming are two different things. 12 Q So what is reviewing to you? 13 A That I would read it word for word. 14 Q Okay. And remind me, your testimony with 15 respect to the 2011 agreement was you don't 16 believe you skimmed it? 17 A Was that this one? 18 Q The third one. 19 A The one with the stamp. 20 Q What about going back to the 2005 agreement that 21 was the one Exhibit <u>11</u>, the first one for 22 \$200,000. Did you skim that one? 23 A I don't remember. 24 Q Do you know whether your ex-husband Steven ever 25 spoke with anyone about your stock redemptions?</p>	<p>1 he was not included in any of this. 2 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 3 Q Did he ever ask Reed for money? 4 A No. 5 Q Did he ever ask Kiesler for money? 6 A No. 7 Q Did Steven ever ask your dad for money? 8 A No. 9 Q Did Steven ask any of your brothers for money? 10 A No. 11 Q Did Steven have any role with respect to the use 12 of your signature stamp? 13 A Role? 14 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Form. 15 Calls for a legal conclusion. 16 THE WITNESS: What do you mean by 17 "role"? 18 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 19 Q Did Steven talk to you at all initially about 20 getting the stamp? 21 A He did not. 22 Q Did Steven ever talk to you about the use of the 23 stamp for a particular document? 24 A He did not. 25 Q Do you ever remember discussing the use of your</p>
Page 194	Page 196
<p>1 Let's start with the first one. Do you know 2 whether Steven spoken with anyone about your 3 2005 stock redemption? 4 A No. He wouldn't have. 5 Q He wouldn't have or he didn't? 6 A He didn't. 7 Q And how do you know that? 8 A Because he knew that they were my stocks, and 9 the money I got was for me to give to him. 10 Q What about the 2007 agreement, did Steven to 11 your knowledge speak with anyone about that 12 agreement? 13 A No, he did not. 14 Q Was he with you when you were at the office 15 skimming the 2007 agreement? 16 A No, he was not. 17 Q What about the 2011 agreement, was Steven 18 involved at all with that one? 19 A No. He didn't come to any of this. 20 Q So to the extent -- if I understand correctly, 21 to the extent Steven had involvement it was that 22 you and he discussed the money that you would 23 need, but otherwise he was not involved? 24 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Object to form. 25 THE WITNESS: He wasn't involved in --</p>	<p>1 signature stamp with Steven? 2 A I'm sure that I told him that Mike Kiesler asked 3 me to have one made, but other than that there 4 was no discussion. 5 Q You may have already answered this, Ms. Randall. 6 Did you say you did skim the 2011 agreement or 7 not? 8 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Asked and 9 answered. 10 THE WITNESS: I don't believe I did. 11 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 12 Q So you didn't know at the time how your shares 13 of stock in Windy Waters were changing as a 14 result of this agreement? 15 A No. I did not know that. 16 Q Is it your testimony that you didn't know that 17 agreement -- that an agreement was being signed 18 at all? 19 A I did not know that they were signing an 20 agreement -- that I was signing an agreement. 21 Q But you knew that you had signed one in 2007, 22 correct? 23 A I knew that I signed one, yes. 24 Q Didn't you assume that you would have to sign an 25 agreement again in 2011?</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 197</p> <p>1 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for</p> <p>2 a legal conclusion. Assumes facts not in evidence.</p> <p>3 THE WITNESS: I didn't know what the</p> <p>4 formula was or how you -- I guess I never really</p> <p>5 thought about it.</p> <p>6 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>7 Q Okay. And I didn't ask about the formula just</p> <p>8 yet. I was asking about the signing of an</p> <p>9 agreement at all. So let me be really clear</p> <p>10 because I don't want you to guess. Did you</p> <p>11 think you didn't have to sign a document for</p> <p>12 purposes of getting the \$200,000 in 2011?</p> <p>13 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection.</p> <p>14 Mischaracterizes her testimony. Calls for a legal</p> <p>15 conclusion, and assumes facts not in evidence.</p> <p>16 THE WITNESS: I did not know that I</p> <p>17 needed to sign every time.</p> <p>18 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>19 Q That's what you thought in 2011?</p> <p>20 A That's what I thought in all of them. I didn't</p> <p>21 know.</p> <p>22 Q Now you have lost me a little bit. You were</p> <p>23 present in 2007 when you signed the 2007</p> <p>24 agreement, correct?</p> <p>25 A Yes.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 199</p> <p>1 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>2 Q You trusted Mike Kiesler at this time in 2011?</p> <p>3 A I trusted Reed and Mike Kiesler through the</p> <p>4 whole thing.</p> <p>5 Q And this was the third time that you had gotten</p> <p>6 some money from -- you didn't discern between</p> <p>7 Windy Waters and Widen, but let's say the</p> <p>8 companies. This is the third time you had gone</p> <p>9 to them for money, correct?</p> <p>10 A Yes.</p> <p>11 Q And this was the third time that you had gotten</p> <p>12 it, correct?</p> <p>13 A Yes.</p> <p>14 Q Do you remember what you spent this money on?</p> <p>15 A Probably taxes, and I don't -- in '11. Steve</p> <p>16 bought a lot of real estate, and I'm thinking</p> <p>17 that -- well, I know the crash really affected</p> <p>18 us.</p> <p>19 Q The stock market crash?</p> <p>20 A Yes. And he probably was behind on some of</p> <p>21 those loans.</p> <p>22 Q Steve you mean?</p> <p>23 A Or us. We. My name was always attached.</p> <p>24 Q And you mean the loans for the homes?</p> <p>25 A Mortgages, yes.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 198</p> <p>1 Q Okay. And you knew you were signing an</p> <p>2 agreement, correct?</p> <p>3 A Yes.</p> <p>4 Q And you knew that you were receiving money as a</p> <p>5 result of redeeming some shares in Windy Waters,</p> <p>6 correct?</p> <p>7 A I did not know where the stocks were coming</p> <p>8 from. Windy Waters, Widen Enterprises I didn't</p> <p>9 know, but I knew I was getting money.</p> <p>10 Q And you knew that you were signing?</p> <p>11 A Yes.</p> <p>12 Q And so 2011 you're saying that you did not</p> <p>13 expect that you would have to sign a new</p> <p>14 agreement?</p> <p>15 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection.</p> <p>16 Mischaracterizes her testimony. Assumes facts not in</p> <p>17 evidence. Calls for a legal conclusion.</p> <p>18 THE WITNESS: At that time I don't</p> <p>19 know what I expected.</p> <p>20 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>21 Q Is it possible that you have just forgotten,</p> <p>22 Ms. Randall?</p> <p>23 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for</p> <p>24 speculation.</p> <p>25 THE WITNESS: Yeah, it is.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 200</p> <p>1 Q Mortgages. Okay. Did it occur to you in 2011</p> <p>2 what the value of your shares might be compared</p> <p>3 to what they had been, say, in 2007 when you had</p> <p>4 done the last redemption?</p> <p>5 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection.</p> <p>6 Foundation.</p> <p>7 THE WITNESS: I never thought about</p> <p>8 it.</p> <p>9 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>10 Q Did it occur to you how the value of your shares</p> <p>11 might be computed for purposes of knowing how</p> <p>12 many shares were redeemed for the \$200,000?</p> <p>13 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Same objection.</p> <p>14 THE WITNESS: I was aware that there</p> <p>15 was a formula to figure them out, but I didn't know</p> <p>16 what, where, or how.</p> <p>17 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>18 Q And when you say you were aware that there was a</p> <p>19 formula, when were you first aware that there</p> <p>20 was a formula?</p> <p>21 A I honestly can't remember that.</p> <p>22 Q Was it prior to the third redemption in 2011?</p> <p>23 A I honestly don't remember.</p> <p>24 Q Did you know when you signed the 2007 redemption</p> <p>25 agreement that that was pursuant to a formula?</p>

Page 201	Page 203
<p>1 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Assumes 2 facts not in evidence. Calls for a legal conclusion. 3 THE WITNESS: I don't think so. 4 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 5 Q Why do you say you don't think so? 6 A I can't remember. 7 Q What does a formula mean to you? 8 A It's a way to make things. 9 Q Do you remember when we were looking at the 10 second shareholder amendment, Exhibit 6, and 11 there is this Exhibit C page? 12 A Yes. 13 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Which exhibit was 14 that? 15 MR. CHURCHILL: It's 6. 16 THE WITNESS: Okay. 17 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 18 Q And if you go to Exhibit C, it should be 19 Windy33095 if you're looking at the bottom right 20 corner. 21 A Okay. That helps me a lot. Yes. 22 Q Do you remember us talking about this before, 23 fair market value per share calculation? 24 A Yes. 25 Q Is this a formula to you?</p>	<p>1 kind of shares I was redeeming. I didn't even know 2 there's different kinds. 3 (Exhibit No. 14 was marked.) 4 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 5 Q Ms. Randall, you have now been handed what's 6 been marked for identification as Exhibit 14 to 7 your deposition. It's a document Bates labeled 8 Windy705 through Windy710. 9 A Yes. 10 Q And this document is also titled, "Stock 11 Redemption Agreement." Do you see that on the 12 first page? 13 A Yes, I do. 14 Q And do you recognize this document? 15 A I do not. 16 Q If you're on the first page, do you see that, 17 "This agreement is entered into effective the 18 1st day of August 2017 by and between Windy 19 Waters Inc., (the corporation) a Wisconsin 20 corporation having offices at 6911 Mangrove 21 Lane, Madison, Wisconsin 53713, and Stacy L. 22 Randall of 1972 Barber Drive, No. 3, 23 Stoughton" -- 24 A Stoughton. 25 Q "Stoughton, Wisconsin 53589." Do you see that?</p>
Page 202	Page 204
<p>1 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Vague. 2 Foundation. 3 THE WITNESS: No. I never thought of 4 it that way. 5 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 6 Q Do you see up at the top it says, "The value of 7 the corporation shall be determined by," and 8 then there's a colon? 9 A Mm-hmm. 10 Q And then there's an explanation of how the value 11 should be determined? 12 A Yes. 13 Q Is this the formula that you thought was being 14 used to value your shares at any point in time? 15 A I didn't see these documents, and if I did, I 16 did not read them or skim them. 17 Q Did you possibly skim Exhibit C, not review but 18 skim? 19 A I honestly don't remember seeing this. 20 Q Do you recall with respect to that 2011 stock 21 redemption that you were not redeeming your 22 voting shares? 23 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for 24 a legal conclusion and assumes facts not in evidence. 25 THE WITNESS: I was never told what</p>	<p>1 A Yes, I do. 2 Q Does that refresh your recollection at all? 3 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Vague. 4 THE WITNESS: Of what? 5 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 6 Q Of entering into the agreement. 7 A How much did I get this time? 8 Q It looks like \$78,000, so less. 9 A 275? No, that's the number of shares. 10 Q If you look down under price -- I think it's 11 always going to be the same. So if you look 12 under price and terms, do you see in the middle 13 paragraph 2? It looks like you got \$78,000 this 14 time, right? 15 A Looks like it, yes. 16 Q Do you remember why \$78,000? 17 A I don't specific -- no. I don't specifically 18 remember. 19 Q Let's look at page 3 and your signature. Do you 20 agree that that's not your stamp? 21 A I agree that's not my stamp. 22 Q Do you remember signing Exhibit 14? 23 A No. 24 Q In 2017 now you're back in Wisconsin obviously, 25 right?</p>

Page 205	Page 207
<p>1 A Yes.</p> <p>2 Q You're in Stoughton?</p> <p>3 A Stoughton.</p> <p>4 Q And do you remember what was going on in your</p> <p>5 life then that you might need \$78,000 as a</p> <p>6 particular sum?</p> <p>7 A 2017 I was contemplating filing for divorce.</p> <p>8 Q And did Steven have anything to do with this</p> <p>9 request, if you recall?</p> <p>10 A I'm not sure.</p> <p>11 Q Do you think that the fact that you were</p> <p>12 contemplating filing for divorce had something</p> <p>13 to do with you needing the money?</p> <p>14 A I don't believe I had talked to an attorney. I</p> <p>15 don't know.</p> <p>16 Q You did get paid the \$78,000?</p> <p>17 A Yes.</p> <p>18 Q And, again, that was in a lump sum?</p> <p>19 A Yes.</p> <p>20 Q And you had to redeem some shares in order to</p> <p>21 get the \$78,000, right?</p> <p>22 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Assumes</p> <p>23 facts not in evidence. Calls for a legal conclusion.</p> <p>24 Calls for speculation.</p> <p>25 THE WITNESS: I didn't specifically</p>	<p>1 A Correct.</p> <p>2 Q And do you have any specific recollection of</p> <p>3 being given this document in advance?</p> <p>4 A No, I do not.</p> <p>5 Q It's fair to say that you knew that in order to</p> <p>6 be paid the \$78,000 that you were redeeming</p> <p>7 Windy Waters shares, right?</p> <p>8 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for</p> <p>9 a legal conclusion and assumes facts not in evidence.</p> <p>10 THE WITNESS: I didn't know what kind</p> <p>11 of stocks I was redeeming.</p> <p>12 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>13 Q You just knew they were stocks, but you didn't</p> <p>14 know whether it was Windy Waters or another</p> <p>15 company?</p> <p>16 A Correct.</p> <p>17 Q Who else could it have been?</p> <p>18 A Widen Enterprises.</p> <p>19 Q Did you have shares in Widen Enterprises?</p> <p>20 A I don't know what I had shares in.</p> <p>21 Q So you thought you were either redeeming shares</p> <p>22 in Widen Enterprises or Windy Waters?</p> <p>23 A Yes.</p> <p>24 Q Did you ask to do anything through Milmont or</p> <p>25 that didn't come up?</p>
Page 206	Page 208
<p>1 say that I needed shares. I just asked for -- I</p> <p>2 would like to get -- I would like to get \$78,000 from</p> <p>3 my stock. That's what I would say.</p> <p>4 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>5 Q And do you remember specifically saying that?</p> <p>6 A No.</p> <p>7 Q Who would you have said that to, Reed?</p> <p>8 A Reed.</p> <p>9 Q And he referred you to Mike Kiesler?</p> <p>10 A Yup. Talk to Kiesler.</p> <p>11 Q And do you remember whether you reviewed this</p> <p>12 2017 Stock Redemption Agreement prior to signing</p> <p>13 it?</p> <p>14 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Object to form.</p> <p>15 THE WITNESS: I did not review it.</p> <p>16 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>17 Q And how do you know that?</p> <p>18 A Because I didn't review any of them.</p> <p>19 Q Did you skim it?</p> <p>20 A At this point probably not.</p> <p>21 Q What do you mean by that, "at this point</p> <p>22 probably not?"</p> <p>23 A I have gone through this a number of times.</p> <p>24 Q And when you say that you're referring to the</p> <p>25 2005, 2007, and 2011 redemptions?</p>	<p>1 A No, I did not.</p> <p>2 Q Why didn't you?</p> <p>3 A Because I never thought of it.</p> <p>4 Q When we talk about Milmont, is that -- for you</p> <p>5 is that the same as talking about the cottage?</p> <p>6 A Yes.</p> <p>7 Q And so would redeeming shares in Milmont mean</p> <p>8 you were losing your right to the cottage?</p> <p>9 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for</p> <p>10 a legal conclusion.</p> <p>11 THE WITNESS: I'm not really sure what</p> <p>12 it would have done because it's never happened.</p> <p>13 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>14 Q I guess I'm wondering whether or not there's</p> <p>15 something to Milmont other than the cottage.</p> <p>16 A There's a cottage and then there's another piece</p> <p>17 of land. There's two cottages on the same</p> <p>18 property. Well, no, they are not on the same</p> <p>19 property, but they cannot be divided, and then</p> <p>20 we have a piece of land on a fishing lake.</p> <p>21 Q But Milmont was not something that you were</p> <p>22 interested in when you said I want to sell some</p> <p>23 stock for some money?</p> <p>24 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Form.</p> <p>25 Mischaracterizes her testimony.</p>

Page 209	Page 211
<p>1 THE WITNESS: I never even thought 2 about Milmont. 3 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 4 Q Why? 5 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Calls for 6 speculation. 7 THE WITNESS: Why didn't I think of 8 it? I don't know why I didn't think of it. I just 9 had always gotten it from whatever company I got -- 10 where my stocks were. 11 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 12 Q Okay. Did you have an attorney representing 13 you? 14 A No. 15 Q With respect to the 2017 Stock Redemption 16 Agreement? 17 A No, I did not. 18 Q Why not? 19 A Because I trusted Reed and Mike Kiesler to be 20 doing the best thing for me. 21 Q Did you interact with an attorney for Windy 22 Waters or Widen Enterprises with respect to the 23 2017 Stock Redemption Agreement? 24 A No, I did not. 25 Q Do you have a memory of signing the 2017 Stock</p>	<p>1 a legal conclusion. 2 THE WITNESS: Authorize? What are you 3 meaning when you say "authorize"? 4 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 5 Q What does authorize mean to you? 6 A I asked you what you meant by authorized. 7 Q Do you like approved better? How about 8 approved? Would you say that you didn't 9 ultimately approve the 2005 Stock Redemption 10 Agreement? 11 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Object again. Calls 12 for a legal conclusion. 13 THE WITNESS: I asked for the money 14 so, yes, I would say I authorized. 15 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 16 Q And you agree that you authorized the sale of 17 stock in order to get the money, correct? 18 A Yes. As far as I knew that's the only way I 19 could get money. 20 Q And using that same definition, asking for money 21 and authorizing the sale of stock to get the 22 money, you also authorized the 2007 Stock 23 Redemption Agreement, correct? 24 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Object to the extent 25 it calls for a legal conclusion.</p>
Page 210	Page 212
<p>1 Redemption Agreement? 2 A I don't have a memory of that. 3 Q You don't have any reason to believe that you 4 didn't sign the agreement, correct? 5 A Correct. 6 Q Did you ask any questions about how your shares 7 were being valued for purposes of the redemption 8 that is represented by the 2017 Stock Redemption 9 Agreement? 10 A No, I did not. 11 Q Did you -- do you remember thinking at all that 12 this Stock Redemption Agreement looked a lot 13 like the prior ones you had signed? 14 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Form. 15 THE WITNESS: I don't really remember 16 thinking that, but it kind of all looked the same to 17 me. I didn't really look at them that closely. I 18 didn't think I needed to. 19 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 20 Q Was there any reason in your mind that any of 21 those prior Stock Redemption Agreements were not 22 authorized by you? In other words, would you 23 say today that you did not authorize the 2005 24 Stock Redemption Agreement? 25 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for</p>	<p>1 THE WITNESS: I would say yes. 2 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 3 Q And same for 2011, you authorized that Stock 4 Redemption Agreement, right, you knew that you 5 were getting money and authorizing the sale of 6 stock in order to get that money, correct? 7 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Same objection. 8 Calls for a legal conclusion. 9 THE WITNESS: Yes. 10 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 11 Q And then with respect to Exhibit <u>14</u>, the 2017 12 Stock Redemption Agreement, again, you 13 authorized the sale of your stock in exchange 14 for \$78,000, correct? 15 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for 16 a legal conclusion. 17 THE WITNESS: Well, each time I asked 18 for money from my stock, so, yes. 19 (Exhibit No. <u>15</u> was marked.) 20 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 21 Q Ms. Randall, the court reporter has now handed 22 you what's been marked for identification as 23 Exhibit <u>15</u> to your deposition as a document 24 Bates labeled Windy711 through 716 titled, 25 "Stock Redemption Agreement." Again, this one</p>

Page 213	Page 215
<p>1 dated January 1, 2019. Do you recognize Exhibit 2 <u>15</u>? 3 A No. I do not. 4 Q Your signature is on page 3. Do you see that? 5 A Yes, I do. 6 Q And do you agree that's your signature? 7 A Yes, I do. 8 Q And going to price and terms, Ms. Randall, on 9 page 1, it looks like you sold your Windy Waters 10 stock for \$120,000. Do you see that? 11 A I do see that. 12 Q Do you have a recollection of doing this in 13 early January of '19? 14 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Object to form. 15 Vague as to doing this. 16 THE WITNESS: Yes, I do. 17 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 18 Q And what do you remember about that particular 19 stock redemption? 20 A That I needed money. 21 Q Do you remember why? 22 A I needed money to pay my divorce lawyer, and I 23 didn't have any money. 24 Q And so you entered into this agreement. Did you 25 get a copy in advance of signing it?</p>	<p>1 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Misstates her 2 testimony. 3 THE WITNESS: Well, now that I see 4 this I remember there's something about a note. He 5 added the 20,000 on for -- I don't recall. 6 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 7 Q Isn't one of the reasons why you were 8 comfortable signing this Stock Redemption 9 Agreement because it was the fifth time that you 10 had done it? 11 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Form. 12 Assumes facts not in evidence. It calls for a legal 13 conclusion. 14 THE WITNESS: Well, this wasn't the 15 same because there was a note -- I can't remember 16 what was involved in this one, and again, I trusted 17 my brother and Mike Kiesler with everything they 18 wrote and had me sign. 19 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 20 Q Did you have an attorney represent you for 21 purposes of the 2019 Stock Redemption Agreement? 22 A No, I did not. 23 Q Do you remember whether Windy Waters had 24 attorneys represent it for the purposes of the 25 2019 Stock Redemption Agreement?</p>
Page 214	Page 216
<p>1 A No. 2 Q Did you skim it before signing it? 3 A I don't remember doing that. 4 Q Do you think you didn't skim it before signing 5 it? 6 A Probably not. 7 Q Was it important for you to skim it before 8 signing it? 9 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Object to form. 10 Calls for a legal conclusion. 11 THE WITNESS: I did not feel that it 12 was. 13 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 14 Q Why? 15 A Because I trusted Mike Kiesler and Reed Widen. 16 Q Would it be fair to say that this is a very 17 similar agreement to four others that you had 18 entered for purposes of selling your Windy 19 Waters stock? 20 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for 21 a legal conclusion. Objection. Foundation. 22 THE WITNESS: No. 23 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 24 Q It doesn't look a lot like the other agreements 25 that you had signed?</p>	<p>1 A I never had information about that. 2 Q Do you have any memory of receiving the document 3 prior to signing it? 4 A No. I did not get it before I signed. 5 Q Did you have to negotiate any of the terms in 6 the 2019 Stock Redemption Agreement? 7 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Object to form. 8 THE WITNESS: There was something 9 about the added 20,000, but I don't remember what 10 that was. 11 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 12 Q Can you -- Ms. Randall, can you point to me 13 where the added 20,000 is? 14 A Well, I asked for 100,000. 15 Q Okay. 16 A And for some reason he gave me 120, and I don't 17 remember what that was for. 18 Q Who is "he"? 19 A Mike Kiesler. 20 Q So your memory is that you only asked for 21 100,000 and he gave you 120 instead? 22 A Yes. 23 Q Were you okay with that or you didn't want to do 24 that? 25 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for</p>

Page 217	Page 219
<p>1 a legal conclusion.</p> <p>2 THE WITNESS: I didn't feel like I had</p> <p>3 much of a choice.</p> <p>4 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>5 Q But you did sign this document, correct?</p> <p>6 A Yes, I did.</p> <p>7 Q And you did redeem some of your shares in Windy</p> <p>8 Waters, Inc., in order to obtain the \$120,000,</p> <p>9 correct?</p> <p>10 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for</p> <p>11 a legal conclusion.</p> <p>12 THE WITNESS: I don't remember the</p> <p>13 specifics about this.</p> <p>14 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>15 Q Like the other redemption agreements, you</p> <p>16 authorized the sale of some of your stock in</p> <p>17 order to get some money back, correct?</p> <p>18 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Same objections.</p> <p>19 Calls for a legal conclusion.</p> <p>20 THE WITNESS: Yes. I did because</p> <p>21 that's the only way I knew to get money.</p> <p>22 (Exhibit No. <u>16</u> was marked.)</p> <p>23 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>24 Q Do you remember when you filed for divorce?</p> <p>25 A November of '18 or '19.</p>	<p>1 A Amy.</p> <p>2 Q Amy, sorry. I don't know why I said Maureen.</p> <p>3 Amy Collins, sorry, and she later became Amy</p> <p>4 Collins O'Hara, correct?</p> <p>5 A Yes.</p> <p>6 Q And you retained her in roughly November of</p> <p>7 2018. Does that sound right?</p> <p>8 A Yes.</p> <p>9 Q And Amy Collins, later Amy Collins O'Hara was an</p> <p>10 attorney with the firm Stafford Rosenbaum; is</p> <p>11 that right?</p> <p>12 A Yes.</p> <p>13 Q And Stafford Rosenbaum was also the firm that</p> <p>14 employed Scott Seid who you spoke about before,</p> <p>15 right?</p> <p>16 A Yes.</p> <p>17 Q When you engaged Ms. Collins, you knew that</p> <p>18 Scott Seid was also an attorney for Windy</p> <p>19 Waters, correct?</p> <p>20 A I knew there was an attorney in the building</p> <p>21 because they had to do a conflict of interest.</p> <p>22 I didn't know who it was.</p> <p>23 Q You didn't know that Scott Seid was the attorney</p> <p>24 for Windy Waters at the time?</p> <p>25 A I wasn't aware of the name, no.</p>
Page 218	Page 220
<p>1 Q So this is -- the court reporter has handed you</p> <p>2 what's been marked for identification as Exhibit</p> <p>3 <u>16</u> to your deposition. And when I think of</p> <p>4 filing dates, I think of when you filed your</p> <p>5 joint petition for divorce. This is a document</p> <p>6 that's not Bates labeled, but this is taken from</p> <p>7 the docket in your divorce proceeding. Do you</p> <p>8 agree that this is your Joint Petition for</p> <p>9 Divorce filed on April 1 of 2019?</p> <p>10 A I did not file on April 1st.</p> <p>11 Q Look at page 4 of Exhibit <u>16</u>. Do you see your</p> <p>12 signature there?</p> <p>13 A Yes, I do.</p> <p>14 Q And that is your signature on the left side</p> <p>15 above Stacy Lee Randall?</p> <p>16 A Yes, it is.</p> <p>17 Q Do you remember when you started using the L for</p> <p>18 Lee instead of the W for Widen?</p> <p>19 A No, I don't.</p> <p>20 Q So you mentioned earlier that you knew that you</p> <p>21 needed some money for your divorce expenses.</p> <p>22 Was part of that need to pay counsel?</p> <p>23 A Yes.</p> <p>24 Q And your divorce attorney was Maureen Collins,</p> <p>25 correct?</p>	<p>1 Q When is the first time that you interacted with</p> <p>2 Scott Seid at all?</p> <p>3 A The only time was when I was signing the</p> <p>4 redemption.</p> <p>5 Q Had you met him before?</p> <p>6 A Never.</p> <p>7 Q And when you say "redemption," you mean May</p> <p>8 2020, right?</p> <p>9 A Yes.</p> <p>10 Q So had you not met Scott Seid prior to that?</p> <p>11 A No, I had not.</p> <p>12 Q You had only spoken with him on the telephone</p> <p>13 prior to May 20 -- May 13, 2020?</p> <p>14 A Just that day.</p> <p>15 (Exhibit No. <u>17</u> was marked.)</p> <p>16 MR. CHURCHILL: You have been handed,</p> <p>17 Ms. Randall, what's been marked as Exhibit <u>17</u> to your</p> <p>18 deposition. What's your Bates number on that, Jess?</p> <p>19 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Stafford000868.</p> <p>20 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>21 Q You mentioned earlier something about a conflict</p> <p>22 waiver, correct?</p> <p>23 A Yes.</p> <p>24 Q And do you recognize Exhibit <u>17</u> as the conflict</p> <p>25 waiver that you signed with Stafford Rosenbaum?</p>

Page 221	Page 223
<p>1 A I don't exactly remember what it looked like.</p> <p>2 Q Sure. So this is a letter dated April 3, 2019.</p> <p>3 Do you see that at the top?</p> <p>4 A Yes.</p> <p>5 Q And it's signed by Amy T. Collins. Do you see</p> <p>6 that at the bottom?</p> <p>7 A Yes, I do.</p> <p>8 Q And it's addressed to you?</p> <p>9 A Yes, it is.</p> <p>10 Q And the letter says, "Dear, Stacy, in November</p> <p>11 2018 you engaged Stafford Rosenbaum, LLP, to</p> <p>12 represent you with respect to a divorce matter.</p> <p>13 As you know, we also represent Windy Waters,</p> <p>14 Inc., (the company) in unrelated corporate</p> <p>15 matters including your redemption of shares of</p> <p>16 the company." Do you see that?</p> <p>17 A Yes.</p> <p>18 Q And then in the next paragraph it states, "We</p> <p>19 believe that our firm's continued representation</p> <p>20 of the company would not adversely affect our</p> <p>21 representation of you; however, in situations</p> <p>22 like this, which happen from time to time, we're</p> <p>23 allowed to represent both clients in the matters</p> <p>24 only if both clients consent. We, therefore,</p> <p>25 have asked whether you will consent to our</p>	<p>1 just note on this document, Exhibit <u>17</u>, there are a</p> <p>2 couple of different dates on here that make it a</p> <p>3 little bit ambiguous including April 3rd, 2019. It</p> <p>4 looks like it was signed it says April 2018, and then</p> <p>5 there's a fax on the top that appears to be April <u>9</u>,</p> <p>6 2019. All of which are after the date of divorce</p> <p>7 proceeding was filed on the 1st of April.</p> <p>8 MR. CHURCHILL: Right. So I asked</p> <p>9 Ms. Randall if she believes that 2018 was a typo or</p> <p>10 just a mistake on her part, and she doesn't remember,</p> <p>11 but she testified that she engaged Ms. Collins in</p> <p>12 November of '18. So we know -- or we don't know. We</p> <p>13 can suspect that maybe you just wrote the wrong date</p> <p>14 that you weren't backdating your conflict waiver.</p> <p>15 Let's set aside the document for a second then and</p> <p>16 ask you generally.</p> <p>17 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>18 Q Do you agree that you waived any conflict with</p> <p>19 Stafford Rosenbaum as to its representation of</p> <p>20 Windy Waters including with respect to the</p> <p>21 redemption of shares of the company by you?</p> <p>22 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for</p> <p>23 a legal conclusion.</p> <p>24 THE WITNESS: I agreed to it, but I'm</p> <p>25 not sure what I was agreeing to.</p>
Page 222	Page 224
<p>1 representation of the company in unrelated</p> <p>2 corporate matters while we represent you with</p> <p>3 respect to your divorce. Please confirm by</p> <p>4 signing one copy of this letter and returning it</p> <p>5 to me by email, fax, or mail. Please call or</p> <p>6 email me if you have any questions." And then</p> <p>7 she signs that. Do you see all of that?</p> <p>8 A Yes, I do.</p> <p>9 Q Does this refresh your recollection as to</p> <p>10 whether or not this was the waiver conflict that</p> <p>11 you signed?</p> <p>12 A Well, this is the one that I signed, yes.</p> <p>13 Q And I assume 2018 down at the bottom is just a</p> <p>14 typo, you meant to probably write 2019 and you</p> <p>15 accidentally wrote 2018?</p> <p>16 A When you said that I retained her in 2019 --</p> <p>17 Q I said 2018, actually. Do you remember November</p> <p>18 2018?</p> <p>19 A Okay.</p> <p>20 Q You agree that in order to use Ms. Collins as</p> <p>21 your attorney that you were waiving any claim of</p> <p>22 conflict with respect to her firm's</p> <p>23 representation of Windy Waters, correct?</p> <p>24 MS. POLAKOWSKI: I will object to the</p> <p>25 extent it calls for a legal conclusion. And, Mark, I</p>	<p>1 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>2 Q Did you ask Ms. Collins to explain it?</p> <p>3 A No. No. Because it seemed like it was no big</p> <p>4 deal.</p> <p>5 Q Did you skim this letter before you signed it?</p> <p>6 A I read it.</p> <p>7 Q So you reviewed this one?</p> <p>8 A Yes, I did.</p> <p>9 Q Word for word?</p> <p>10 A Yes, I did.</p> <p>11 Q And did you have an opportunity to ask her any</p> <p>12 questions?</p> <p>13 A I probably could have.</p> <p>14 Q Did you?</p> <p>15 A No.</p> <p>16 Q And are you aware whether Windy Waters had to</p> <p>17 sign its own conflict waiver with Stafford</p> <p>18 Rosenbaum in order for Stafford Rosenbaum to</p> <p>19 represent you?</p> <p>20 A I was not aware of that.</p> <p>21 Q Have you ever seen the form of waiver that Windy</p> <p>22 Waters signed with Stafford Rosenbaum in order</p> <p>23 for Stafford Rosenbaum to represent it and also</p> <p>24 you?</p> <p>25 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Assumes</p>

Page 225	Page 227
<p>1 facts not in evidence.</p> <p>2 THE WITNESS: I did not see that.</p> <p>3 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>4 Q Have you ever been told that there was a waiver</p> <p>5 signed by Windy Waters just like the waiver or</p> <p>6 similar to the waiver that you signed?</p> <p>7 A No.</p> <p>8 Q Do you believe that Stafford Rosenbaum had a</p> <p>9 conflict that you had not waived?</p> <p>10 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for</p> <p>11 a legal conclusion.</p> <p>12 THE WITNESS: What do you mean by</p> <p>13 that? Can you rephrase it?</p> <p>14 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>15 Q Sure. Do you believe that Stafford Rosenbaum</p> <p>16 had a conflict of interest in that it was</p> <p>17 representing Windy Waters for purposes of your</p> <p>18 share redemptions and also representing you for</p> <p>19 purposes of your divorce?</p> <p>20 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Same objection. Also</p> <p>21 vague as to timing.</p> <p>22 THE WITNESS: For my divorce I don't</p> <p>23 think that -- it was just Amy that was dealing with</p> <p>24 my divorce. Nobody else.</p> <p>25 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p>	<p>1 3:59 p.m.</p> <p>2 (Brief recess taken.)</p> <p>3 (Exhibit No. <u>18</u> was marked.)</p> <p>4 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the</p> <p>5 record at 4:17 p.m.</p> <p>6 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>7 Q Ms. Randall, the court reporter has handed you</p> <p>8 what's been marked for identification as Exhibit</p> <p>9 <u>18</u> to your deposition. It's a document titled,</p> <p>10 "Notice of Motion and Motion to Modify Temporary</p> <p>11 Order." Do you see that?</p> <p>12 A Yes.</p> <p>13 Q And in the top right corner it indicates a</p> <p>14 filing date, if you see that, of April 22, 2020.</p> <p>15 Do you see that?</p> <p>16 A Yes.</p> <p>17 Q Am I correct that this was a filing in the</p> <p>18 divorce proceeding with your ex-husband?</p> <p>19 A Yes.</p> <p>20 Q And did this particular filing to modify</p> <p>21 temporary order by your ex-husband have anything</p> <p>22 to do with the reason why you came to Reed in</p> <p>23 May asking for additional money?</p> <p>24 A Yes.</p> <p>25 Q I don't want to pretend to summarize the whole</p>
Page 226	Page 228
<p>1 Q And nobody else includes also not Scott Seid,</p> <p>2 correct?</p> <p>3 A As far as I knew.</p> <p>4 Q You knew he was not your attorney, didn't you?</p> <p>5 A I didn't even know his name.</p> <p>6 Q But your understanding was that Amy Collins was</p> <p>7 your attorney and no one else?</p> <p>8 A For my divorce?</p> <p>9 Q Yes.</p> <p>10 A Yes.</p> <p>11 Q Did you believe that Stafford Rosenbaum was your</p> <p>12 attorney for any other purpose?</p> <p>13 A Yes.</p> <p>14 Q What purpose was that?</p> <p>15 A When it came to all that, why we're here. I</p> <p>16 thought that Scott Seid would be an attorney for</p> <p>17 me also.</p> <p>18 Q And he did ultimately tell you that he was not</p> <p>19 your attorney, correct?</p> <p>20 A I don't believe he told me that.</p> <p>21 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Mark, we have been</p> <p>22 going about another hour. Is now a good spot?</p> <p>23 MR. CHURCHILL: Now is probably a good</p> <p>24 time.</p> <p>25 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Off the record.</p>	<p>1 document, but to state it generally your husband</p> <p>2 was basically asking for you to pay him for</p> <p>3 money, correct?</p> <p>4 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection.</p> <p>5 Foundation.</p> <p>6 THE WITNESS: When is this dated?</p> <p>7 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>8 Q April of 2020, April 22 of 2020.</p> <p>9 A No. I didn't have any money.</p> <p>10 Q Flip to the last page of the filing, if you</p> <p>11 would. If you need to review other portions of</p> <p>12 it, obviously please do so, but I'm looking at</p> <p>13 paragraph 13 of Exhibit <u>18</u>. Are you there?</p> <p>14 A Mm-hmm.</p> <p>15 Q And "I" -- that's your husband is the I --</p> <p>16 ex-husband, sorry. "I am asking that the court</p> <p>17 modify the existing temporary order," then</p> <p>18 subpart A, "Requiring Stacy to either take over</p> <p>19 some additional expenses or pay temporary</p> <p>20 maintenance to me. B, requiring Stacy to</p> <p>21 contribute to my future attorney fees which are</p> <p>22 necessary to proceed with this case, and C, for</p> <p>23 any additional relief the court deems</p> <p>24 appropriate." Do you see that?</p> <p>25 A Yes.</p>

Page 229	Page 231
<p>1 Q So does this refresh your recollection that your 2 husband was essentially asking for you to pay 3 him more money? 4 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Form. 5 Mischaracterizes the document. Foundation. 6 THE WITNESS: Yes, it does. 7 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 8 Q Were you concerned at the time that if your 9 husband was successful with this filing that you 10 were going to have to pay something called 11 maintenance to him? 12 A No. 13 Q Why were you not concerned about that? You just 14 said you didn't have any money. 15 A I wasn't concerned because I didn't have any 16 money. So I had no money to give him. 17 Q If -- strike that. 18 Did developments in your divorce 19 proceeding cause you to reach out to Reed on May 20 the 5th and say that you needed some money? 21 A It probably had something to do with it, yes. 22 Q I'm going to ask you a couple questions or a few 23 questions about Exhibit <u>18</u>. 24 A Okay. 25 Q Would you look at paragraph 10, please?</p>	<p>1 alleges was a fact that Stacy inherited 2 significant assets in line 2. Do you see that? 3 A Yes. 4 Q Do you know what he was referring to? 5 A I really don't. 6 Q Did you inherit gold coins from your parents? 7 A Yes, I did. 8 Q Did you inherit silver bars from your parents? 9 A Yes, I did. 10 Q Did you inherit any gold bars from your parents? 11 A I haven't looked in there in a while. I believe 12 there's one or two small bars. 13 Q And when you say "there," what are you referring 14 to, a safe? 15 A My safe. 16 Q And where is your safe, at your house? 17 A Yes. 18 Q Do you still own the gold coins? 19 A Yes, I do. 20 Q Do you still own the silver bars? 21 A Yes, I do. 22 Q Do you still own the gold bars? 23 A Yes, I do. 24 Q Do you know the value of the gold coins? 25 A I do not.</p>
Page 230	Page 232
<p>1 A Yes. 2 Q That paragraph reads, "My attorney contacted 3 Stacy's attorney to see if Stacy would agree to 4 contribute to some of the costs. Stacy 5 inherited significant assets and upon 6 information and belief has been able to meet her 7 budget by relying on those assets. The response 8 that we received was that Stacy was not willing 9 to provide any financial help and that I should 10 sell my condominium instead." Do you see that? 11 A Yes. 12 Q Do you know what condominium? 13 A 1972 Barber Drive. 14 Q And was that a condominium that he owned? 15 A We owned. 16 Q And so if he sold the Barber Drive condominium, 17 the assets would have been split between the two 18 of you? 19 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for 20 a legal conclusion. 21 THE WITNESS: Yes, they would have. 22 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 23 Q And was he living there alone at the time? 24 A Yes, he was. 25 Q You saw his reference to the fact -- or what he</p>	<p>1 Q Do you know the value of the silver bars? 2 A No. 3 Q Do you know the value of the gold bars? 4 A No. 5 Q Have you ever had anyone estimate the value of 6 the gold coins? 7 A No. 8 Q Have you ever had anyone estimate the value of 9 the silver bars? 10 A No. 11 Q Have you ever had anyone value an estimate of 12 the gold bars? 13 A No. 14 Q Why have you not redeemed any of those -- any of 15 that gold or silver for cash? 16 A Because I had no reason to. 17 Q Did you ever consider redeeming any of those 18 assets, specifically I mean the gold coins, the 19 silver bars and the gold bars, instead of going 20 to Reed for more cash? 21 A No, I did not. 22 Q Why did you not? 23 A I just didn't think of it. 24 Q Was it an option for you? 25 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for</p>

Page 233

1 speculation.
2 THE WITNESS: No.
3 BY MR. CHURCHILL:
4 Q Why not?
5 A Well, I just because I never thought about it.
6 So I don't think it was an option. Those are
7 put away. You don't see them; you don't think
8 about them.
9 Q If you had -- so are you stating that you didn't
10 remember that you had them in the safe?
11 A No.
12 Q So if you had wanted to you could have redeemed
13 the gold coins for cash, couldn't you?
14 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for
15 speculation.
16 THE WITNESS: I didn't think about
17 redeeming those for cash then or ever.
18 BY MR. CHURCHILL:
19 Q I understand that's your testimony, but my
20 question is could you have redeemed the gold
21 coins for cash?
22 MS. POLAKOWSKI: And I will object
23 again. Calls for speculation.
24 THE WITNESS: Could I have? No.
25 BY MR. CHURCHILL:

Page 234

1 Q Why not?
2 A Because I don't want to.
3 Q So is that the only reason why you couldn't
4 have?
5 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for
6 speculation.
7 THE WITNESS: I have never ever, ever
8 thought about it until just now.
9 BY MR. CHURCHILL:
10 Q If you had wanted to redeem the gold coins for
11 cash, could you have, or is there something
12 that's preventing you from doing so other than
13 your desire not to?
14 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection calls for
15 speculation. Calls for legal conclusion.
16 THE WITNESS: I just don't want to.
17 BY MR. CHURCHILL:
18 Q So that's the only reason, correct?
19 A Yes.
20 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Same objections.
21 BY MR. CHURCHILL:
22 Q No one else has a claim to the gold coins other
23 than you, correct?
24 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for
25 speculation.

Page 235

1 THE WITNESS: Nobody has -- can you
2 read that back for me, please?
3 (Last question read back.)
4 MS. POLAKOWSKI: And same objections.
5 THE WITNESS: Until I die.
6 BY MR. CHURCHILL:
7 Q Same question with respect to the silver bars,
8 the only thing that prevented you from redeeming
9 them for cash is that you didn't want to, right?
10 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for
11 speculation.
12 THE WITNESS: I didn't think of it.
13 BY MR. CHURCHILL:
14 Q There's that, and then otherwise it's just
15 because you didn't want to redeem them for cash,
16 correct?
17 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Same objection.
18 THE WITNESS: I didn't think of it. I
19 never thought about selling, and I never have.
20 BY MR. CHURCHILL:
21 Q So if you had thought about selling the silver
22 bars as a way to get cash, was there anything
23 preventing you from doing so?
24 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for
25 speculation and for a legal conclusion.

Page 236

1 THE WITNESS: I don't know what I
2 would have done.
3 BY MR. CHURCHILL:
4 Q That wasn't my question. This is just like the
5 gold coins. Isn't the only thing that stopped
6 you from redeeming the silver bars for cash was
7 your desire not to?
8 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for
9 a legal conclusion and speculation.
10 THE WITNESS: And that I never thought
11 about it.
12 BY MR. CHURCHILL:
13 Q So those two things?
14 A Correct.
15 Q Same question for the gold bars, the only thing
16 that stopped you from redeeming them for cash
17 was that you never thought about them and that
18 you don't want to, correct?
19 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Same objections.
20 THE WITNESS: The biggest reason is
21 because I never even thought about it.
22 BY MR. CHURCHILL:
23 Q And the other reason is that you don't want to?
24 A Right.
25 Q Do you have any other heirlooms from your

Page 237	Page 239
<p>1 parents through your inheritance?</p> <p>2 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Object to form.</p> <p>3 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>4 Q Do you know what I mean by "heirloom," like a</p> <p>5 family heirloom?</p> <p>6 A Like a watch?</p> <p>7 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Vague as to time.</p> <p>8 THE WITNESS: I have my mother's</p> <p>9 watch.</p> <p>10 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>11 Q You got that as part of your inheritance through</p> <p>12 the estate?</p> <p>13 A Yes.</p> <p>14 Q Any other -- strike that.</p> <p>15 Do you know what the value is of your</p> <p>16 mother's watch?</p> <p>17 A I do not.</p> <p>18 Q Have you ever had it appraised?</p> <p>19 A No.</p> <p>20 Q Do you believe it's valuable?</p> <p>21 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for</p> <p>22 speculation.</p> <p>23 THE WITNESS: That I don't know.</p> <p>24 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>25 Q Is there anything else that you inherited that</p>	<p>1 Foundation. Form.</p> <p>2 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>3 Q When Steven wrote -- or his attorney wrote that</p> <p>4 you inherited significant assets, that's what</p> <p>5 I'm speaking of specifically, something that you</p> <p>6 inherited that's considered a significant asset.</p> <p>7 Those are his words, but anything else that</p> <p>8 occurs to you?</p> <p>9 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Same objections.</p> <p>10 THE WITNESS: Not that I can think of.</p> <p>11 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>12 Q Do you recall that there was going to be a</p> <p>13 hearing set on your ex-husband's motion to</p> <p>14 modify temporary order for May 18 of 2020?</p> <p>15 A Do I have recollection of that? Yes.</p> <p>16 (Exhibit No. <u>19</u> was marked.)</p> <p>17 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>18 Q The court reporter has now handed you what's</p> <p>19 been marked as Exhibit <u>19</u> for identification,</p> <p>20 and this is another document from your divorce</p> <p>21 proceeding. Do you agree?</p> <p>22 A Yes.</p> <p>23 Q And it's a notice of hearing, if you look at the</p> <p>24 top, from the circuit court of Dane County filed</p> <p>25 April 23, 2020. Do you see that, Ms. Randall,</p>
Page 238	Page 240
<p>1 would be considered a valuable asset to you?</p> <p>2 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for</p> <p>3 speculation. Also vague as to value.</p> <p>4 THE WITNESS: I got her pearls.</p> <p>5 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>6 Q Do you know their value?</p> <p>7 A No.</p> <p>8 Q Have you ever had them appraised?</p> <p>9 A No.</p> <p>10 Q Anything else?</p> <p>11 A I cannot think of anything else. It's been so</p> <p>12 long.</p> <p>13 Q Any vehicles of any type?</p> <p>14 A No.</p> <p>15 Q Any boats of any type?</p> <p>16 A Other than the ones at Milmont.</p> <p>17 Q You didn't obtain a boat through inheritance,</p> <p>18 right, it wasn't something you were inherited?</p> <p>19 A Well, it was -- the cottage was given to us. So</p> <p>20 I don't know if that's inheritance or not.</p> <p>21 Q Is there anything else that you can think of</p> <p>22 that might qualify as a significant asset that</p> <p>23 Steven was talking about in his filing on April</p> <p>24 22?</p> <p>25 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection.</p>	<p>1 up at the top right?</p> <p>2 A Yes.</p> <p>3 Q And it states that there is a motion hearing set</p> <p>4 for May 18, 2020. Do you see that?</p> <p>5 A Yes.</p> <p>6 Q And in the middle there's a single line</p> <p>7 paragraph that states, "Attorney Hazen's motion</p> <p>8 to modify the temporary order." Do you see</p> <p>9 that?</p> <p>10 A Yes.</p> <p>11 Q And that's a reference to your ex-husband's</p> <p>12 attorney, right?</p> <p>13 A Yes.</p> <p>14 Q And do you remember that this hearing was going</p> <p>15 to be scheduled in May?</p> <p>16 A I don't remember the date, no.</p> <p>17 Q Was the fact that this hearing was upcoming on</p> <p>18 your ex-husband's motion to modify temporary</p> <p>19 order one of the reasons why you called Reed on</p> <p>20 May the 5th?</p> <p>21 A Yes.</p> <p>22 Q Were there other reasons that you called Reed on</p> <p>23 May the 5th?</p> <p>24 A I needed to pay my attorney, and I was running</p> <p>25 out of money.</p>

Page 241	Page 243
<p>1 Q Were you concerned that the temporary order was</p> <p>2 going to be modified as your husband had</p> <p>3 requested in the motion filed with the divorce</p> <p>4 court?</p> <p>5 A I honestly don't remember what the original</p> <p>6 agreement was, so. I don't know what you mean</p> <p>7 by modified.</p> <p>8 Q Were you originally paying your husband</p> <p>9 maintenance on a monthly basis prior to the</p> <p>10 order being modified?</p> <p>11 A No. I was not.</p> <p>12 Q Do you remember the court issuing an order that</p> <p>13 you were to pay your ex-husband monthly amounts</p> <p>14 in maintenance?</p> <p>15 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection.</p> <p>16 Foundation.</p> <p>17 THE WITNESS: I'm not certain.</p> <p>18 (Exhibit No. <u>20</u> was marked.)</p> <p>19 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>20 Q I got a document for you.</p> <p>21 A I'm sure you do.</p> <p>22 Q The court reporter has handed you now what's</p> <p>23 been marked for identification as Exhibit <u>20</u> to</p> <p>24 your deposition. And you will see in the top</p> <p>25 right corner that this was filed on May the</p>	<p>1 condominium at 1972 Barber Drive, Unit 3,</p> <p>2 Stoughton, Wisconsin, on the market for sale."</p> <p>3 Do you see that?</p> <p>4 A Yes, I do.</p> <p>5 Q And, in fact, you did have to start paying your</p> <p>6 ex-husband \$4,000 per month, correct?</p> <p>7 A Yes.</p> <p>8 Q Do you remember when the \$4,000 figure</p> <p>9 specifically first came out?</p> <p>10 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection.</p> <p>11 Foundation.</p> <p>12 THE WITNESS: After I sold my stock.</p> <p>13 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>14 Q Did that number get set at the hearing itself,</p> <p>15 or was that a proposed figure prior to the May</p> <p>16 18 hearing?</p> <p>17 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection.</p> <p>18 Foundation.</p> <p>19 THE WITNESS: I believe they came in</p> <p>20 asking for 6,000.</p> <p>21 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>22 Q "They" meaning Steven and his attorney?</p> <p>23 A Steve and his attorney.</p> <p>24 Q And how did you settle on \$4,000?</p> <p>25 A My attorney --</p>
Page 242	Page 244
<p>1 21st. So this would be after that April -- May</p> <p>2 18 hearing, correct?</p> <p>3 A Yes.</p> <p>4 Q Did you attend the May 18 hearing?</p> <p>5 A No.</p> <p>6 Q Why didn't you attend?</p> <p>7 A There was no place to go because it was COVID.</p> <p>8 Q Was it a remote hearing?</p> <p>9 A Video.</p> <p>10 Q Okay. That makes sense. And do you recognize</p> <p>11 this document titled, "Amended Temporary Order"?</p> <p>12 A Yes. I do remember this.</p> <p>13 Q Okay. Under the order part of the temporary</p> <p>14 order, do you see down kind of towards the</p> <p>15 bottom in capitals, it says, "It is hereby</p> <p>16 ordered," do you see that?</p> <p>17 A Yes.</p> <p>18 Q The document says, "Effective June 15, 2020,</p> <p>19 Stacy Randall shall pay directly to Steven</p> <p>20 Randall \$4,000 per month. Characterization of</p> <p>21 these payments as either contribution to</p> <p>22 expenses or an advance on property division</p> <p>23 shall be determined by agreement of the parties</p> <p>24 or by the court at the final hearing." And then</p> <p>25 paragraph 2, "Steven Randall shall place the</p>	<p>1 MS. POLAKOWSKI: I'm going to caution</p> <p>2 you at this point to not disclose things that you</p> <p>3 discussed with your attorney.</p> <p>4 THE WITNESS: My attorney came up with</p> <p>5 it. That's not true. The person that was listening</p> <p>6 to all of this because I had to give expenses and</p> <p>7 Steve had to give his expenses, she or he said that</p> <p>8 he won't agree to the 6,000, but he would agree to</p> <p>9 4,000.</p> <p>10 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>11 Q To your best recollection did you know about the</p> <p>12 \$4,000 as something that you would owe prior to</p> <p>13 the hearing on May 18th, or did it get decided</p> <p>14 on May 18th?</p> <p>15 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection.</p> <p>16 Foundation.</p> <p>17 THE WITNESS: I had no idea why he</p> <p>18 wanted this.</p> <p>19 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>20 Q Did you remember when you first learned that you</p> <p>21 would have to pay the 4,000, like what date?</p> <p>22 A No. I don't remember what date that was.</p> <p>23 Q Do you think you knew or learned about it prior</p> <p>24 to receiving the order that is Exhibit <u>20</u>?</p> <p>25 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for</p>

Page 245	Page 247
<p>1 speculation.</p> <p>2 THE WITNESS: I did not know about it</p> <p>3 prior.</p> <p>4 (Exhibit No. <u>21</u> was marked.)</p> <p>5 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>6 Q The court reporter has now handed you what's</p> <p>7 been marked for identification as Exhibit <u>21</u> to</p> <p>8 your deposition, Ms. Randall.</p> <p>9 A Yes.</p> <p>10 Q It is a two-page document labeled Windy47391 to</p> <p>11 47392, and it is a series of texts on the second</p> <p>12 page. First page I believe is just a cover</p> <p>13 page. There's a series of texts on page 2. Do</p> <p>14 you see those?</p> <p>15 A Yes.</p> <p>16 Q Do you recognize these as texts between you and</p> <p>17 your brother Reed?</p> <p>18 A Yes.</p> <p>19 Q That's his -- he's indicated as owner, that's</p> <p>20 his phone number, right, 608-217-5910?</p> <p>21 A Last I knew that was his phone number.</p> <p>22 Q Okay. And you did, in fact, text your brother</p> <p>23 on the 5th of May 2020 at 4:14 p.m. and write,</p> <p>24 "Steve is taking me to court. He wants me to</p> <p>25 pay him maintenance. His reasons are all</p>	<p>1 ask after this May 5, 2020, text exchange with</p> <p>2 your brother about whether or not there was</p> <p>3 money that could be provided to you through</p> <p>4 Milmont?</p> <p>5 A Did not.</p> <p>6 Q Why not?</p> <p>7 A I didn't know what he meant by take care of</p> <p>8 through Milmont. So I didn't have questions to</p> <p>9 ask because I didn't know.</p> <p>10 Q You knew at the time that Milmont included the</p> <p>11 cottages, correct?</p> <p>12 A Yes.</p> <p>13 Q So is it your testimony that you didn't</p> <p>14 understand that taking care of it in Milmont</p> <p>15 referred to something to do with the cottages?</p> <p>16 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection.</p> <p>17 Mischaracterizes her testimony.</p> <p>18 THE WITNESS: I figured that it</p> <p>19 probably had something to do with the cottages.</p> <p>20 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>21 Q Do you have a sentimental attachment to the</p> <p>22 cottages?</p> <p>23 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Form.</p> <p>24 Vague.</p> <p>25 THE WITNESS: I used to have a huge</p>
Page 246	Page 248
<p>1 bullshit. I'm going to need to get some money."</p> <p>2 A Yes.</p> <p>3 Q And your brother Reed wrote back at 5:25 p.m.,</p> <p>4 "We have a Covod problem." He accidently</p> <p>5 misspelled COVID, right? "Your timing couldn't</p> <p>6 be worse. We might have to take care of it in</p> <p>7 Milmont." Do you see that?</p> <p>8 A Yes.</p> <p>9 Q Why did you reach out to your brother?</p> <p>10 A I always reached out to my brother when I wanted</p> <p>11 to cash in some of my stock.</p> <p>12 Q And your brother had always agreed, right?</p> <p>13 A No. He told me to talk to Kiesler.</p> <p>14 Q Ultimately, you had redeemed the stock when you</p> <p>15 had requested it, though, correct?</p> <p>16 A Yes.</p> <p>17 Q What did you understand at the time him to mean</p> <p>18 by his reference to might have to take care of</p> <p>19 it in Milmont?</p> <p>20 A I didn't ask. I don't know. It never came up</p> <p>21 again.</p> <p>22 Q But what did it mean to you at the time,</p> <p>23 anything?</p> <p>24 A No.</p> <p>25 Q You said it never came up again. Did you ever</p>	<p>1 sentimental value, but I don't have that anymore.</p> <p>2 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>3 Q At the time of this redemption, which would have</p> <p>4 been -- well, actually we're not at the</p> <p>5 redemption yet. So May of 2020. So more than</p> <p>6 three years ago did you have that sentimental</p> <p>7 attachment to Milmont?</p> <p>8 A Yes.</p> <p>9 Q Would you have been interested in that time</p> <p>10 frame, May of 2020, in selling off part of your</p> <p>11 interest in the cottages?</p> <p>12 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for</p> <p>13 speculation.</p> <p>14 THE WITNESS: I never thought about</p> <p>15 it.</p> <p>16 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>17 Q But you would have been interested?</p> <p>18 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Same objection.</p> <p>19 THE WITNESS: I don't know what I</p> <p>20 would have thought at that time.</p> <p>21 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>22 Q Isn't it true that when the topic of Milmont</p> <p>23 came up later after the redemption and closer to</p> <p>24 the time of you filing suit that you made it</p> <p>25 clear that you didn't want to part with your</p>

Page 249	Page 251
<p>1 interest in Milmont?</p> <p>2 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection.</p> <p>3 Foundation. Assumes facts not in evidence.</p> <p>4 THE WITNESS: Milmont had nothing to</p> <p>5 do with this suit.</p> <p>6 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>7 Q Did you try to explore other ways to obtain</p> <p>8 money other than a sale of your stock from Windy</p> <p>9 Waters?</p> <p>10 A No.</p> <p>11 Q Did you apply for any loans?</p> <p>12 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Vague as</p> <p>13 to timing.</p> <p>14 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>15 Q We're still talking in this May 2020 time frame</p> <p>16 prior to your May 18 hearing in your divorce</p> <p>17 case.</p> <p>18 A No.</p> <p>19 Q In that same time frame prior to your May 18</p> <p>20 hearing while your divorce proceeding was going</p> <p>21 on, did you ask other family members for money?</p> <p>22 A No.</p> <p>23 Q In that same time frame did you take money out</p> <p>24 of retirement accounts?</p> <p>25 A No.</p>	<p>1 Q How many?</p> <p>2 A I believe there was eight.</p> <p>3 Q And do you know their approximate value at the</p> <p>4 time?</p> <p>5 A I did not.</p> <p>6 Q Did you consider selling any of the eight condos</p> <p>7 that you owned?</p> <p>8 A No.</p> <p>9 Q Why not?</p> <p>10 A That was part of our income at the time.</p> <p>11 Q When you say "our income," you mean --</p> <p>12 A Steve and I.</p> <p>13 Q -- you and Steven? And how did you get that</p> <p>14 income, you rented them out?</p> <p>15 A Yes.</p> <p>16 Q And did you obtain lease -- excuse me, did you</p> <p>17 obtain rental income on all eight?</p> <p>18 A Yes.</p> <p>19 Q Where is Cottage Grove?</p> <p>20 A It's between --</p> <p>21 Q Sorry. I don't know.</p> <p>22 A I think it's south of Madison, but I don't know.</p> <p>23 Q How long had you had those condos?</p> <p>24 A I really don't know.</p> <p>25 Q Do you still own those condos today?</p>
Page 250	Page 252
<p>1 Q Did you consider moving?</p> <p>2 A In May of 2020?</p> <p>3 Q Yes.</p> <p>4 A I had already moved, so, no.</p> <p>5 Q Where were you living at the time?</p> <p>6 A I was living in an apartment that I'm still in</p> <p>7 in McFarland.</p> <p>8 Q Did you have an obligation in May of 2020 for</p> <p>9 condo payments?</p> <p>10 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for</p> <p>11 a legal conclusion.</p> <p>12 THE WITNESS: I didn't think so.</p> <p>13 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>14 Q But did you? You said you didn't think so. Did</p> <p>15 you have an obligation for condo payments in May</p> <p>16 of 2020?</p> <p>17 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for</p> <p>18 a legal conclusion. Asked and answered.</p> <p>19 THE WITNESS: I don't know.</p> <p>20 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>21 Q Did you have any rental properties at the time</p> <p>22 in May of 2020 prior to May 18?</p> <p>23 A Yes.</p> <p>24 Q What were those rental properties?</p> <p>25 A They were condominiums in Cottage Grove.</p>	<p>1 A I do not.</p> <p>2 Q Were those -- any of those eight condo</p> <p>3 properties that you and Steven purchased with</p> <p>4 some of the money you got from the prior stock</p> <p>5 redemptions?</p> <p>6 A No.</p> <p>7 Q You mentioned earlier in your testimony that</p> <p>8 there were properties that Steven had purchased.</p> <p>9 Do you remember that?</p> <p>10 A Yes.</p> <p>11 Q What properties were you discussing then?</p> <p>12 A The properties in Florida.</p> <p>13 Q And did you still have those properties in May</p> <p>14 of 2020?</p> <p>15 A No.</p> <p>16 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection to form.</p> <p>17 Mischaracterizes her testimony.</p> <p>18 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>19 Q What were those properties exactly?</p> <p>20 A I didn't have much interest in that. I believe</p> <p>21 most of them were homes.</p> <p>22 Q When you say you didn't have much interest, do</p> <p>23 you mean like personal intellectual interest or</p> <p>24 financial interest?</p> <p>25 A Intellectual.</p>

Page 253	Page 255
<p>1 Q Do you know when those homes were sold?</p> <p>2 A Most of them were not sold.</p> <p>3 Q What happened to them?</p> <p>4 A They were -- unbeknownst to me I thought my</p> <p>5 husband was paying the whatever and he was not.</p> <p>6 Q The whatever you mean a mortgage?</p> <p>7 A Yes. And so most of them went to short sales.</p> <p>8 Q The bank foreclosed on the mortgages?</p> <p>9 A I don't believe there was any foreclosures, but</p> <p>10 I'm not positive.</p> <p>11 Q And how many Florida properties are you talking</p> <p>12 about?</p> <p>13 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection.</p> <p>14 Foundation.</p> <p>15 THE WITNESS: I can't even guess. I</p> <p>16 was not happy about it.</p> <p>17 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>18 Q As of let's say May 18, again, 2020 all of those</p> <p>19 Florida properties were gone, in other words,</p> <p>20 you didn't have an interest in them anymore?</p> <p>21 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection.</p> <p>22 Foundation.</p> <p>23 THE WITNESS: I didn't have -- I</p> <p>24 didn't have an interest in them?</p> <p>25 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p>	<p>1 possessing it?</p> <p>2 A He was possessing it.</p> <p>3 Q So was it really your car?</p> <p>4 A That's --</p> <p>5 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for</p> <p>6 a legal conclusion.</p> <p>7 THE WITNESS: That's what the</p> <p>8 agreement was when we walked into the dealership.</p> <p>9 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>10 Q Whose name was the title in?</p> <p>11 A It was in one of our LLCs.</p> <p>12 Q Which LLC?</p> <p>13 A I don't recall.</p> <p>14 Q How many LLCs did you and Steven have?</p> <p>15 A I'm not really sure.</p> <p>16 Q Do you know the names of any of your LLCs?</p> <p>17 A One of them was a number Willows. I can't</p> <p>18 remember if it was Two Willows or Three Willows</p> <p>19 something Willows.</p> <p>20 Q And what was the purpose of that LLC?</p> <p>21 A I don't know.</p> <p>22 Q Did you have anything to do with its creation?</p> <p>23 A No, I did not.</p> <p>24 Q Was any of your money used for purposes of its</p> <p>25 operation?</p>
Page 254	Page 256
<p>1 Q Financial interest. They were no longer part of</p> <p>2 the property -- or they were no longer a</p> <p>3 financial asset of you and Steven?</p> <p>4 A That's right.</p> <p>5 Q Did you consider refinancing any mortgages prior</p> <p>6 to the hearing on May 18, 2020?</p> <p>7 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Assumes</p> <p>8 facts not in evidence.</p> <p>9 THE WITNESS: I did not.</p> <p>10 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>11 Q What cars did you have at that time leading up</p> <p>12 to May 18, 2020? Did you still have your</p> <p>13 Cadillac?</p> <p>14 A I had my Cadillac, yes.</p> <p>15 Q And you owned that car at that time, right? You</p> <p>16 no longer had to pay any finance payments?</p> <p>17 A Correct.</p> <p>18 Q What about the Infinity, did you have the</p> <p>19 Infinity?</p> <p>20 A No. I did not. Steve did.</p> <p>21 Q That was his car?</p> <p>22 A Supposed to be my car, but, yes, it turned out</p> <p>23 to be his.</p> <p>24 Q When you say it was his, do you mean that he</p> <p>25 actually had paid you to drive it or he was just</p>	<p>1 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection.</p> <p>2 Foundation.</p> <p>3 THE WITNESS: I would have to say that</p> <p>4 everything that we had was from my money.</p> <p>5 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>6 Q Do you know whether or not your personal</p> <p>7 finances were co-mingled with Two Willows, LLC?</p> <p>8 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection.</p> <p>9 Foundation.</p> <p>10 THE WITNESS: I don't know that.</p> <p>11 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>12 Q Do you remember the name of any other LLCs set</p> <p>13 up by you and Steve?</p> <p>14 A Set up by Steve.</p> <p>15 Q Set up by Steve.</p> <p>16 A I don't. It's been quite a while.</p> <p>17 Q Do you remember roughly how many?</p> <p>18 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection.</p> <p>19 Foundation.</p> <p>20 THE WITNESS: (Shakes head.)</p> <p>21 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>22 Q So you said "set up by Steve." He was using</p> <p>23 your name also?</p> <p>24 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection.</p> <p>25 Foundation.</p>

Page 257	Page 259
<p>1 THE WITNESS: I don't know how LLCs 2 work. I don't know how many names you have to put on 3 them, but I'm assuming, yes, my name was on them. 4 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 5 Q Do you ever remember signing any documents 6 related to those LLCs? 7 A I remember signing documents, but I'm not 8 certain what they were for. 9 Q Did you review the documents before signing 10 them? 11 A I did not. 12 Q Ms. Randall, would you say that it was your 13 practice to skim documents before signing rather 14 than reviewing them? 15 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Form. 16 Mischaracterizes her testimony. 17 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 18 Q Do you understand what I mean by my question as 19 to whether it was your practice? 20 A Did I normally do it? 21 Q Yeah. 22 A Yes. Any of the documents that I signed were 23 all written or however you want to explain it by 24 people that I trusted. So I did not normally 25 read things.</p>	<p>1 condo association. 2 Q Did you in this time frame, again prior to May 3 18, 2020, try to sell any of the personal items 4 that you had? We have already gone over the 5 gold and silver, and we know that's a no, but 6 did you try to sell anything else? 7 A I don't think so. 8 Q Like any furniture? 9 A No. 10 Q Any jewelry? 11 A Definitely not jewelry. 12 Q Any heirlooms or parts of your inheritance? 13 A No. 14 Q Did you consider holding a garage sale or yard 15 sale, rummage sale? 16 A Before we moved back to Wisconsin we had a big 17 garage sale. 18 Q Was that down in Florida? 19 A Yes. 20 Q Did you do that at any time leading up to the 21 May 18 time frame of 2020? 22 A No. 23 Q After you moved to Wisconsin? 24 A No. 25 Q Did you apply for any jobs once you got back to</p>
Page 258	Page 260
<p>1 Q So far the only document that you indicated that 2 you -- that we have talked about today that you 3 indicated that you reviewed word for word was 4 the conflict waiver. Would you agree with that? 5 A Yes. 6 Q In May of 2020, again, leading up to May 18, did 7 you have hired help for you? 8 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Form. 9 Vague. 10 THE WITNESS: Like what kind of hired 11 help? 12 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 13 Q So, for example, did you have somebody helping 14 keep up your house or apartment? 15 A Prior to that? Steve did hire somebody. He had 16 a reason. I can't remember what it was. 17 Q And what was that person doing? 18 A Cleaning. 19 Q Okay. Sorry, I didn't mean to cut you off. 20 A They cleaned. 21 Q And how often did they come? 22 A Every other week. 23 Q What about a lawn service, did you have one of 24 those? 25 A We lived in a condo, and it was included in the</p>	<p>1 Wisconsin leading up to the May 18, 2020, date? 2 A I did not. 3 Q Did you ever apply for public benefits? 4 A No. I did not. 5 Q Do you know if you qualified? 6 A No. I do not. 7 Q Did you ever apply for food stamps? 8 A No. I did not. 9 Q Do you know if you qualified? 10 A I don't know. 11 Q Tell me what happened after your text exchange 12 that we just went over with your brother. So 13 that's kind of the early evening of May the 5th. 14 Do you remember what happened next? 15 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Form. 16 Vague. 17 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 18 Q Did you have any more conversations that day 19 with anybody at Windy Waters or Widen? 20 A I don't remember specifically the dates. 21 Q Do you remember -- I told you to keep your 22 Complaint close because I think that might be 23 helpful for you as we move through some of the 24 remaining facts. 25 Ms. Randall, if you would, and this is</p>

Page 261	Page 263
<p>1 Exhibit 2 for your deposition, I think if you</p> <p>2 turn to page 14 that will get us on track in</p> <p>3 terms of where we are. You certainly can refer</p> <p>4 to 13 if you need to see. I was going to start</p> <p>5 asking you about some of your allegations in</p> <p>6 paragraph 70 and after. Do you need a moment to</p> <p>7 look at it?</p> <p>8 A Yes, I do. I remember this.</p> <p>9 Q Okay. So I think you said again that Reed told</p> <p>10 you to speak with Kiesler?</p> <p>11 A Yes.</p> <p>12 Q And to the best of your recollection once you</p> <p>13 got done with that text exchange with your</p> <p>14 brother Reed on May 5, did you speak with him</p> <p>15 again or text or communicate with him again in</p> <p>16 any way until your actual signing of the</p> <p>17 redemption on May 13, do you remember?</p> <p>18 A I'm not -- not before my redemption.</p> <p>19 Q Is it correct that Mike Kiesler called you on</p> <p>20 May 6th?</p> <p>21 A Yes.</p> <p>22 Q And you told him that you needed \$100,000; is</p> <p>23 that correct?</p> <p>24 A Yes.</p> <p>25 Q Why \$100,000?</p>	<p>1 the company was going to be around or not, and</p> <p>2 also he said something about accepting or not</p> <p>3 accepting COVID money. I have no idea what that</p> <p>4 meant, but they had to let somebody know whether</p> <p>5 they were going to take it or leave it.</p> <p>6 Q Did you understand him to be referencing the</p> <p>7 government or you don't know?</p> <p>8 A I assumed that.</p> <p>9 Q What else do you remember him saying?</p> <p>10 A The only way we can give you any money would be</p> <p>11 to redeem all your stocks.</p> <p>12 Q And what did you say in response?</p> <p>13 A I don't want to redeem all my stocks. That's my</p> <p>14 life savings.</p> <p>15 Q And at some point he discussed with you a dollar</p> <p>16 figure, right, in that conversation 1.1 million</p> <p>17 dollars?</p> <p>18 A I can't remember what conversation, but</p> <p>19 somewhere in there he mentioned that.</p> <p>20 Q So we're still in this May 6 phone call that I</p> <p>21 believe was in the morning. Do you remember</p> <p>22 that he mentioned the 1.1 million dollar value</p> <p>23 in that phone conversation?</p> <p>24 A I do.</p> <p>25 Q Do you remember Mr. Kiesler discussing how that</p>
Page 262	Page 264
<p>1 A Because I had no money.</p> <p>2 Q But why the amount \$100,000?</p> <p>3 A I figured that -- I thought that would get me</p> <p>4 through a year.</p> <p>5 Q And what did he say?</p> <p>6 A He told me that they didn't have \$100,000 to</p> <p>7 give me.</p> <p>8 Q And when you say he said, "They didn't," who did</p> <p>9 you think he meant?</p> <p>10 A The company.</p> <p>11 Q And so did you then change the amount to 50,000?</p> <p>12 A Yes.</p> <p>13 Q And what did he say in response to that?</p> <p>14 A Same thing.</p> <p>15 Q Did Mike Kiesler mention COVID at all?</p> <p>16 A Oh, yes.</p> <p>17 Q In that conversation on the phone?</p> <p>18 A I don't know if it was that particular</p> <p>19 conversation.</p> <p>20 Q Tell me -- you said, "Oh, yes." Tell me what he</p> <p>21 said to you about COVID in the context of this</p> <p>22 redemption negotiation or discussion.</p> <p>23 A He told me they could not give me 100,000 or</p> <p>24 50,000 because COVID had been very hard on the</p> <p>25 company and that they -- he did not know whether</p>	<p>1 value was computed?</p> <p>2 A No.</p> <p>3 Q You don't remember or he didn't do it?</p> <p>4 A He didn't tell me.</p> <p>5 Q Sorry, I have a tickle in my nose.</p> <p>6 Do you remember him stating that the</p> <p>7 figure that he computed was based only on</p> <p>8 November 2019 financials and that he would need</p> <p>9 to update that number?</p> <p>10 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Form.</p> <p>11 Are we still talking about the May 6 conversation?</p> <p>12 MR. CHURCHILL: Yeah.</p> <p>13 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>14 Q Do you remember him talking about November 2019</p> <p>15 financials?</p> <p>16 A I do not remember that.</p> <p>17 Q Do you remember him telling you that the 1.1</p> <p>18 million dollar figure would need to be updated?</p> <p>19 A No.</p> <p>20 Q Do you remember him walking through any part of</p> <p>21 the financials that were the basis for the 1.1</p> <p>22 million dollars?</p> <p>23 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Form.</p> <p>24 Vague.</p> <p>25 THE WITNESS: Walk me through the</p>

Page 265	Page 267
<p>1 financials?</p> <p>2 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>3 Q Did he walk through any calculations for you?</p> <p>4 Did he explain anything to you?</p> <p>5 A Not at that time.</p> <p>6 Q Did there come a time that he did explain part</p> <p>7 of the calculation to you or any of the</p> <p>8 calculation to you?</p> <p>9 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Form.</p> <p>10 THE WITNESS: There was a time when I</p> <p>11 was arguing with him about redeeming all my stocks</p> <p>12 and how I did not want to do that, that he told me</p> <p>13 that the same formula that we used for your other</p> <p>14 brothers is the same -- is the one we're using for</p> <p>15 you.</p> <p>16 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>17 Q Did that reassure you at all?</p> <p>18 A No.</p> <p>19 Q Did you discuss with him, with Mr. Kiesler, that</p> <p>20 the same formula that was used for your prior</p> <p>21 redemptions was also being used for this</p> <p>22 redemption?</p> <p>23 A No.</p> <p>24 Q Did you believe that the formula that was being</p> <p>25 used in May 2020, that was being offered to you,</p>	<p>1 A No. I did not.</p> <p>2 Q Did you understand that there was going to need</p> <p>3 to be an agreement written up for your stock</p> <p>4 redemption if you were to pursue it?</p> <p>5 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for</p> <p>6 speculation.</p> <p>7 THE WITNESS: I don't know what I</p> <p>8 thought.</p> <p>9 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>10 Q Is there any reason why you wouldn't have</p> <p>11 expected a Stock Redemption Agreement to be</p> <p>12 drawn up like you had drawn up for the prior</p> <p>13 five times?</p> <p>14 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Same objection. Also</p> <p>15 calls for a legal conclusion.</p> <p>16 THE WITNESS: I did not think about</p> <p>17 it.</p> <p>18 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>19 Q You said you were so mad. Why were you so mad?</p> <p>20 A Because he was telling me I had to do this, take</p> <p>21 it or leave it. And he gave me three hours to</p> <p>22 make my decision.</p> <p>23 Q And you ultimately decided to leave it, right,</p> <p>24 you didn't do it?</p> <p>25 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Vague.</p>
Page 266	Page 268
<p>1 was different than any of your prior</p> <p>2 redemptions?</p> <p>3 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection.</p> <p>4 Foundation. Assumes facts not in evidence.</p> <p>5 THE WITNESS: I don't remember</p> <p>6 thinking that.</p> <p>7 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>8 Q You did remember that you had redeemed shares</p> <p>9 before, correct?</p> <p>10 A Yes.</p> <p>11 Q Were you concerned that the formula was</p> <p>12 different?</p> <p>13 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Same objections.</p> <p>14 THE WITNESS: I can't remember</p> <p>15 thinking that.</p> <p>16 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>17 Q Did you think it might be the same, the formula?</p> <p>18 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Assumes</p> <p>19 facts not in evidence.</p> <p>20 THE WITNESS: I don't remember what I</p> <p>21 was thinking. I was so angry.</p> <p>22 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>23 Q When you were in that conversation with</p> <p>24 Mr. Kiesler, did you make any request to see</p> <p>25 financial information of the company?</p>	<p>1 THE WITNESS: I didn't decide</p> <p>2 anything.</p> <p>3 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>4 Q Did you accept the 1.1 million dollar redemption</p> <p>5 price for all of your shares?</p> <p>6 A No, I did not.</p> <p>7 Q And you intentionally did not accept it,</p> <p>8 correct?</p> <p>9 A Yes.</p> <p>10 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for</p> <p>11 a legal conclusion.</p> <p>12 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>13 Q In your Complaint you used the word fair with</p> <p>14 respect to your conversation with Mr. Kiesler,</p> <p>15 for example, if you look at paragraph 79. Do</p> <p>16 you see that?</p> <p>17 A Yes.</p> <p>18 Q Paragraph 79 reads, "Kiesler insured Stacy that</p> <p>19 the price was fair." Do you see that?</p> <p>20 A Yes.</p> <p>21 Q Is that the word Mr. Kiesler used, or is that</p> <p>22 you summarizing the conversation?</p> <p>23 A I believe that's his words.</p> <p>24 Q You believe he used the word "fair"?</p> <p>25 A Yes.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 269</p> <p>1 Q You testified that Mr. Kiesler told you that the 2 formula that was used was the same formula that 3 had been used for your brothers, correct? 4 A Yes. 5 Q Was that part of his explanation for why it was 6 fair? 7 A I'm not sure why he said that was fair. I told 8 him I am not my brothers. I don't care what 9 they did. I don't know what they did, but I 10 don't feel that this is a fair price. 11 Q And what was the reason -- again, we're talking 12 May 6, right? What was the reason in that 13 conversation why you thought it was not a fair 14 price? 15 A 1 million dollars. Well, I had a feeling that 16 the company was worth more than that, and he 17 continued to tell me they had no money. We 18 don't know if we're going to be around. COVID 19 was really hard on us. I don't know if we will 20 ever be able to give you money if you don't take 21 this. So that's the extent of it. 22 Q Did you know at the time that your brother Price 23 Widen had redeemed his remaining shares of his 24 stock in Windy Waters in 2015, in other words, 25 had been completely bought out?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 271</p> <p>1 A He told me that he had really good news, that 2 Matthew and he came up with another \$250,000. 3 And he also told me that he was given another 4 three days to decide whether they wanted the 5 COVID money or not. 6 MR. CHURCHILL: We can take a break 7 now, not quite this second. I think that the 8 additional money came up in a later conversation, but 9 I will have you figure out whether or not that's the 10 case. 11 Your Complaint states that in his call 12 back on May 6th he gave you more time, but it doesn't 13 look like there was additional money discussed until 14 May 13th. But I will get some documents together 15 that will help you as well. Why don't we take a 16 break? 17 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Off the record at 18 5:17 p.m. 19 (Brief recess taken.) 20 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the 21 record. This will mark the beginning of media unit 22 number 4 of the video recorded deposition of Stacy 23 Randall. Today's date is August 28th, 2023, and the 24 time is 5:34 p.m. 25 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 270</p> <p>1 A I did not know when any of them sold out. 2 Q Other than knowing the exact date, were you 3 aware in May of 2020 that Price no longer held 4 any shares in the company? 5 A I did not know that. 6 Q Did you know that -- at the time in May 2020 did 7 you know that Price had signed a redemption 8 agreement? 9 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Assumes 10 facts not in evidence. 11 THE WITNESS: I didn't know anything 12 about what Price was doing. 13 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Mark, we have been at 14 it for just about another hour. If there's time to 15 take a break, that would be great. 16 MR. CHURCHILL: I just have a couple 17 more and then I'll take a break. 18 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 19 Q You mentioned the three-hour time frame, and 20 then you mentioned that a few -- I'm looking at 21 paragraph 86 of your Complaint. "A few minutes 22 before the three-hour deadline ran Kiesler 23 called Stacy again." Do you see that? 24 A Yes. 25 Q And what did Mr. Kiesler say to you?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 272</p> <p>1 Q Ms. Randall, I actually put a document on top of 2 your pile there. It was Exhibit <u>13</u>. Do you see 3 that? 4 A Yes. 5 Q I realize that I forgot to ask you one question 6 about that stock redemption. So this is the 7 January 2011 stock redemption, and you remember 8 we discussed this one earlier. In the order of 9 things it would be number 3. Do you remember 10 that, or do you remember that testimony from 11 earlier today? 12 A Yes. 13 Q And you got the \$200,000 as a result of 14 redeeming your stock, correct? 15 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for 16 a legal conclusion. 17 THE WITNESS: Yes. 18 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 19 Q And my question, which I forgot to ask you was, 20 was that a lump sum payment like the other ones? 21 A Yes. 22 Q Thank you. You can put that to the side now. 23 We were talking a little bit about COVID in that 24 conversation -- in some conversation that you 25 had with Mike Kiesler. You testified you</p>

Page 273

1 weren't sure which conversation it was, but that
2 it came up; is that correct?
3 A That is correct.
4 Q Was it your understanding that COVID was
5 presenting challenges for the companies or did
6 you not know one way or the other?
7 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection.
8 Foundation.
9 THE WITNESS: I had no way of knowing.
10 BY MR. CHURCHILL:
11 Q Did Mr. Kiesler say anything about the
12 possibility that COVID might impact the actual
13 payments to you if you were to reach an
14 agreement for the stock redemption?
15 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Same objection.
16 THE WITNESS: Can you say that again,
17 please?
18 MR. CHURCHILL: Can you read that back
19 for me?
20 (Last question read back.)
21 THE WITNESS: Not in so many words.
22 BY MR. CHURCHILL:
23 Q Did you understand that there was a potential
24 that you might have to repay any money that you
25 got back as a part of a Stock Redemption

Page 274

1 Agreement if COVID had certain impacts on the
2 company?
3 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection.
4 Foundation. Also assumes facts not in evidence.
5 THE WITNESS: It never occurred to me.
6 I never heard anything about that.
7 BY MR. CHURCHILL:
8 Q If COVID had had that type of impact on the
9 company, would you have repaid the money that
10 you had gotten from any of your Stock Redemption
11 Agreements?
12 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for
13 speculation.
14 THE WITNESS: I have no idea what it
15 would have done.
16 BY MR. CHURCHILL:
17 Q Going back to your Complaint if you still have
18 that handy.
19 A I sure do.
20 Q I'm on page 16 and paragraph 91. Are you there,
21 Ms. Randall?
22 A Yes.
23 Q Paragraph 91 reads, "Stacy told Kiesler that she
24 would need to talk with her financial advisor
25 and attorney." Do you see that?

Page 275

1 A Yes.
2 Q And, again, to orient you on where we are, this
3 is end of the day May 6th, right, are you with
4 me?
5 A Yes.
6 Q Do you remember saying that to Mr. Kiesler?
7 A Yes, I do.
8 Q The financial advisor that you were referencing,
9 was that Mark Goff?
10 A Yes, it was.
11 Q And the attorney that you were referencing, who
12 would that have been?
13 A Probably Scott Seid.
14 Q Not Ms. Collins O'Hara?
15 A No.
16 Q Why not her?
17 A I don't think -- I probably thought that she
18 doesn't know anything about -- she's a divorce
19 attorney.
20 Q Did you reach out to Scott Seid after the
21 conversation with Mr. Kiesler on May the 6th?
22 A I did not.
23 Q Did you reach out to any other attorney, other
24 than Scott Seid, after the conversation with
25 Mike Kiesler on May the 6th?

Page 276

1 A Well, the only other one that I would have
2 reached out to because I don't know lawyers
3 would be Amy, but I don't recall.
4 Q You mentioned earlier that you had discussed
5 things with your son Justin; isn't that correct?
6 A Yes.
7 Q Didn't he recommend that you get an attorney?
8 A This is on May 6th?
9 Q Any time after the conversation with Mike
10 Kiesler.
11 MS. POLAKOWSKI: The May 6th
12 conversation?
13 MR. CHURCHILL: Yes.
14 THE WITNESS: Yes.
15 BY MR. CHURCHILL:
16 Q And why didn't you do what your son suggested?
17 A Because I didn't have the time.
18 Q Did you reach out to any attorneys on May the
19 7th or May the 8th, May the 9th, May the 10th,
20 May the 11th, or May the 12th?
21 A May 12th I did.
22 Q Who did you reach out to on May 12th?
23 A Was that the day I signed?
24 Q May 13 is the day you signed.
25 A Then I didn't reach out to anybody.

Page 277	Page 279
<p>1 Q Why didn't you have the time in the week between 2 May 6 and May 13 to reach out to an attorney? 3 A Because I was given three hours to make my 4 decision, and then Kiesler called me back and 5 told me that they -- and I don't know who "they" 6 was or is -- gave him another three days. 7 Q Okay. And then -- but you didn't sign anything 8 or redeem your stock in those three days, 9 correct? 10 A Correct. 11 Q So no three-day deadline was enforced; isn't 12 that right? 13 A That's right. 14 Q So, again, why didn't you ever call an attorney 15 until you called Scott Seid? 16 A I didn't know any attorneys to call. 17 Q Did your son Justin know any attorneys to call? 18 A He was going to try to get ahold of somebody. 19 Q And what happened, do you know? 20 A This person said that they didn't have time to 21 do what Justin was asking, I believe. 22 Q What about conversations with Mr. Goff, you did 23 reach out to him, didn't you? 24 A Yes. 25 Q How long had he been your financial advisor, if</p>	<p>1 timing on the email. The metadata actually 2 indicates that this email is not from 4:59 p.m., 3 but is from 11:59 a.m. I'm not sure why that is 4 or why that happens. Sometimes it's something 5 where things convert to something known as GMT 6 time. I don't really know, but I will represent 7 to you that the time stamp on what's printed out 8 is wrong and the actual time stamp is on 9 something that your counsel is holding right 10 now. 11 The reason why I raise it is because 12 there's a couple communications that you have 13 and the time is jumping around a little bit, but 14 I think that when we get through with it, you 15 will agree with me on the order of things. 16 So regardless, let's look at the content 17 of Exhibit 22. This is a text between you and 18 Mark Goff. Do you see that? 19 A Yes. 20 Q And it's on May 6th? 21 A Yes. 22 Q And it's actually right before lunch time, 23 believe it or not, and not 4:59 p.m. You say, 24 "Mark, Steve is taking me to court. I'm going 25 to need -- I'm going to need to pull money from</p>
Page 278	Page 280
<p>1 you recall? 2 A I don't know. 3 Q Well, let's say starting in May 2020, was it 4 more than ten years? 5 A No. 6 Q Can you give me an estimate of roughly when you 7 started using Mark Goff? 8 A It was after I moved back to Wisconsin. 9 Q Which I think you said was 2012. 10 A Yes. So it was between probably -- I didn't do 11 it then. Maybe '16 to '18. I'm questioning 12 myself. 13 Q That's fair. Did Mr. Goff help you at all with 14 any of the LLCs that Steven had set up? 15 A No, he did not. 16 Q Did he only help you with your personal 17 portfolio, or did he help you with more than 18 that? 19 A Just me. 20 (Exhibit No. 22 was marked.) 21 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 22 Q The court reporter is handing you what's been 23 marked for identification as Exhibit 22 to your 24 deposition. I will just note for the record 25 that we discovered something funky about the</p>	<p>1 my stock to cover all this divorce bullshit. 2 The accountant at Widens just called me with an 3 offer. He told me I have to either take it or 4 leave it. If I leave it, they cannot give me 5 any money at this time or in the foreseeable 6 future. He told me I need to decide by 3:00 7 p.m. today. Please call me. I need your 8 advice." Did I read that correctly? 9 A Yes. 10 Q And the accountant that you're talking about is 11 Mike Kiesler, right? 12 A Yes. 13 Q And you state in there the bit about the take it 14 or leave it, which is what you testified to 15 earlier today, correct? 16 A Yes. 17 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Mark, just for the 18 record, I accept your representation as to the timing 19 of this text message, obviously subject to 20 confirmation. 21 MR. CHURCHILL: Yeah. 22 (Exhibit No. 23 was marked.) 23 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 24 Q You now have in front of you what's been marked 25 for identification as Exhibit 23. Do you have</p>

Page 281	Page 283
<p>1 it, Ms. Randall?</p> <p>2 A Yes.</p> <p>3 Q And you can see why I was focused on the time</p> <p>4 because this says 12:16, and I think that is</p> <p>5 correct. So I will represent to you that I</p> <p>6 believe this was a subsequent text from you to</p> <p>7 Mark Goff -- excuse me, to Justin Randall.</p> <p>8 And this is a document produced as</p> <p>9 Randall116. You said to Justin in your text,</p> <p>10 "Kiesler was extremely cocky with me. He told</p> <p>11 me that Widens might even be around in seven</p> <p>12 years. I could end up with nothing if I don't</p> <p>13 take this offer. I tried to explain to him that</p> <p>14 this is a really big deal. It's what I have to</p> <p>15 live on for the rest of my life. I need time to</p> <p>16 talk to my people. He told me I need to take it</p> <p>17 or leave it. If I turn it down, sorry we can't</p> <p>18 help you." Do you see that?</p> <p>19 A Yes.</p> <p>20 Q Do you remember if Justin responded to your</p> <p>21 text?</p> <p>22 A I'm sure he did. That's probably maybe when he</p> <p>23 told me that I need to get an attorney to look</p> <p>24 at Widens' financials.</p> <p>25 Q You think as a result of that text from you?</p>	<p>1 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Okay. So your</p> <p>2 suggestion is that the timing on both of these texts</p> <p>3 is off?</p> <p>4 MR. CHURCHILL: Correct. So the two</p> <p>5 to Goff are both off. So the first Goff text was at</p> <p>6 11:59 a.m., not 4:59 a.m., and this Goff text is at</p> <p>7 2:58 p.m., not 7:58 p.m. The timing on the one with</p> <p>8 Justin I think is correct.</p> <p>9 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Just so the record is</p> <p>10 clear as well, note that the email found on Exhibit</p> <p>11 <u>24</u> is also on the backside of Exhibit <u>22</u>.</p> <p>12 MR. CHURCHILL: Double-sided?</p> <p>13 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Yeah. That was part</p> <p>14 of my confusion.</p> <p>15 MR. CHURCHILL: Is that on the</p> <p>16 witness's copy?</p> <p>17 MS. POLAKOWSKI: I believe so, but we</p> <p>18 can check. Do you have Exhibit <u>22</u>, Stacy? It is on</p> <p>19 the witness's copy.</p> <p>20 MR. CHURCHILL: Okay. I don't think</p> <p>21 that was intentional. Okay. That just means we</p> <p>22 could have used one document instead of two.</p> <p>23 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>24 Q So Exhibit <u>24</u> is also on the back of Exhibit <u>22</u></p> <p>25 apparently, but let's use <u>24</u> now because it's</p>
Page 282	Page 284
<p>1 A Mm-hmm.</p> <p>2 Q Did you speak with Justin on the phone?</p> <p>3 A We talked back and forth in all different ways</p> <p>4 during this time.</p> <p>5 MR. CHURCHILL: I'm going to hand this</p> <p>6 document to the court reporter, and it has what I</p> <p>7 think is the correct time written on it if that's</p> <p>8 okay, Jess, just because I think it will be helpful</p> <p>9 for the record. It's written in a time and circled.</p> <p>10 It's reflected in the metadata report that I just</p> <p>11 gave you.</p> <p>12 (Exhibit No. <u>24</u> was marked.)</p> <p>13 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>14 Q Okay. So, Ms. Randall, the court reporter has</p> <p>15 handed you what's been marked for identification</p> <p>16 as Exhibit <u>24</u>, and I just indicated that there's</p> <p>17 a different time stamp written on it because I</p> <p>18 believe the actual time of this communication is</p> <p>19 2:58 p.m. and not 7:58 p.m.</p> <p>20 MS. POLAKOWSKI: I will just note for</p> <p>21 the record, I'm confused now because we weren't</p> <p>22 talking about that email previously, I don't believe.</p> <p>23 MR. CHURCHILL: Right. So the first</p> <p>24 one -- this is another text from her to Mr. Goff, and</p> <p>25 it's just a couple hours after Exhibit <u>22</u>.</p>	<p>1 got the time written on it in a circle as 2:58</p> <p>2 p.m. Are you there?</p> <p>3 A Yes.</p> <p>4 Q Exhibit <u>24</u> is a follow up text from you to Mark</p> <p>5 Goff. Do you see that?</p> <p>6 A I do.</p> <p>7 Q And you state in your text, "Are you alive?</p> <p>8 Have COVID-19? Maybe you are on some tropical</p> <p>9 island some place soaking in the sun. I am in</p> <p>10 need of money. I asked Reed if I could please</p> <p>11 pull some cash from stocks. This is what I was</p> <p>12 told, Widens is telling me that the only way</p> <p>13 they can help me is for them to buy me out. It</p> <p>14 would be 1.1 million dollars over seven years</p> <p>15 paying me monthly \$14,000. Supposedly it has</p> <p>16 something to do with COVID bail-out money. I</p> <p>17 would obviously have to invest this money. My</p> <p>18 accountant is out until Monday so I don't have</p> <p>19 an opinion from a tax point."</p> <p>20 Do you remember who the accountant was?</p> <p>21 Was that Scott Spangler that you're talking</p> <p>22 about?</p> <p>23 A Yes.</p> <p>24 Q So you asked Mr. Goff continuing, "Do you think</p> <p>25 this is something I should consider? I found</p>

Page 285	Page 287
<p>1 out about this offer at around 10:00 a.m. this</p> <p>2 morning. They are giving me until 3:00 p.m. to</p> <p>3 decide. If I don't take this offer, there's</p> <p>4 nothing they can do to help me. Sorry is what</p> <p>5 the accountant at Widens told me. Mind you this</p> <p>6 is the only money I have to live on for the rest</p> <p>7 of my life. Yours truly, Stacy Randall." Do</p> <p>8 you remember sending that text?</p> <p>9 A I remember the first sentence for sure. Yeah, I</p> <p>10 do remember it.</p> <p>11 Q And do you remember communicating with Mr. Goff</p> <p>12 after sending this text?</p> <p>13 A I can't remember where he was or if he was just</p> <p>14 ignoring me or what. That's why I asked all</p> <p>15 those questions.</p> <p>16 Q Do you remember whether or not you had a phone</p> <p>17 call after texting him?</p> <p>18 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Vague as</p> <p>19 to timing.</p> <p>20 THE WITNESS: I do not remember.</p> <p>21 (Exhibit No. <u>25</u> was marked.)</p> <p>22 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>23 Q Ms. Randall, now you have been handed what's</p> <p>24 been marked as Exhibit <u>25</u> for identification.</p> <p>25 It's a document produced as Randall328, and this</p>	<p>1 all of the incoming profit right back into the</p> <p>2 business. So they never make any money. He</p> <p>3 gave me the way they have evaluated the company</p> <p>4 shares since 1991. It has nothing to do with</p> <p>5 how good or how bad the company is doing. He</p> <p>6 was trying to tell me in seven years my stock</p> <p>7 would still be worth 1.1 million. I don't</p> <p>8 understand how that could be. Just when I was</p> <p>9 going to call him back, he was calling me. It</p> <p>10 was at 3:58." Do you see that?</p> <p>11 A Yes, I do.</p> <p>12 Q And it references a discussion that Mike had</p> <p>13 with you where he gave you -- he gave -- you</p> <p>14 wrote, "He gave me the way they have evaluated</p> <p>15 the company shares since 1991." Do you see</p> <p>16 that?</p> <p>17 A Yes.</p> <p>18 Q So was that a discussion that Mr. Kiesler had</p> <p>19 with you about the redemption agreements or you</p> <p>20 just don't remember?</p> <p>21 A I don't remember.</p> <p>22 Q Do you remember me asking you earlier whether or</p> <p>23 not Mr. Kiesler had gone over financial</p> <p>24 information with you?</p> <p>25 A Yes.</p>
Page 286	Page 288
<p>1 is another text from you to Mr. Goff, correct?</p> <p>2 A It appears that way.</p> <p>3 Q And, again, May 6th, 2020, and the time is 4:30</p> <p>4 p.m. Do you agree with that?</p> <p>5 A Yes.</p> <p>6 Q And I have no change to make to the time. This</p> <p>7 seems to be correct. And you state in your</p> <p>8 text, "Thanks for helping me know what I should</p> <p>9 say." Do you see that first sentence?</p> <p>10 A I do.</p> <p>11 Q Does that help remind you whether you had a</p> <p>12 phone call or not?</p> <p>13 A I don't remember if it was a phone -- just the</p> <p>14 way it's worded I think that I was just thanking</p> <p>15 him for his help.</p> <p>16 Q You had communicated somehow with Mr. Goff,</p> <p>17 correct?</p> <p>18 A Yes.</p> <p>19 Q And you wrote -- you texted here, "Mike's</p> <p>20 attitude sure turned around in a hurry when I</p> <p>21 told him that I would like to hire someone that</p> <p>22 would represent me to look at the books and do</p> <p>23 their own evaluation of the company. I told him</p> <p>24 I have never thought they had an interest in my</p> <p>25 well-being. He told me that the company puts</p>	<p>1 Q And this appears to indicate that he did go over</p> <p>2 some financial information with you on May the</p> <p>3 6th; isn't that right?</p> <p>4 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection.</p> <p>5 Mischaracterizes the document.</p> <p>6 THE WITNESS: I wasn't thinking of</p> <p>7 this as financial information.</p> <p>8 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>9 Q You told Mr. Goff that Mr. Kiesler gave you the</p> <p>10 way they had evaluated the company shares since</p> <p>11 1991; isn't that right?</p> <p>12 A Yes.</p> <p>13 Q And you have no reason to believe that what you</p> <p>14 texted to Mr. Goff wasn't true when you wrote</p> <p>15 it?</p> <p>16 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection.</p> <p>17 Foundation.</p> <p>18 THE WITNESS: I'm sure that it was the</p> <p>19 truth.</p> <p>20 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>21 Q And then you said to Mr. Goff, you said -- and</p> <p>22 I'm going right back to the middle here. We</p> <p>23 just were reading up where it says, "Just when I</p> <p>24 was going to call him back, he was calling me.</p> <p>25 It was at 3:58. I had to chuckle thinking he</p>

Page 289	Page 291
<p>1 was going to pressure me for a decision." Why</p> <p>2 did you say that?</p> <p>3 A Because I hadn't contacted him and the three</p> <p>4 hours was nearing.</p> <p>5 Q It says that you were going to chuckle. It</p> <p>6 sounds like you had one over on him. He was</p> <p>7 calling you --</p> <p>8 A Well, I had my answer.</p> <p>9 Q So why did you say you were going to chuckle?</p> <p>10 You weren't feeling very pressed, it doesn't</p> <p>11 seem like.</p> <p>12 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Form.</p> <p>13 Mischaracterizes the document.</p> <p>14 THE WITNESS: I had to chuckle because</p> <p>15 he was calling. He wasn't waiting for me to call</p> <p>16 him.</p> <p>17 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>18 Q You wrote, "I had to chuckle thinking he was</p> <p>19 going to pressure me for a decision." Isn't</p> <p>20 that an indication that you weren't feeling</p> <p>21 pressure?</p> <p>22 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection.</p> <p>23 Mischaracterizes her testimony.</p> <p>24 THE WITNESS: That I wasn't feeling</p> <p>25 pressure?</p>	<p>1 again." Do you see that?</p> <p>2 A Yes.</p> <p>3 Q Paragraph 87 the reads, "Kiesler told Stacy that</p> <p>4 he had good news, that he had been given another</p> <p>5 three days for Stacy to accept the all or</p> <p>6 nothing offer." Do you see that?</p> <p>7 A Yes.</p> <p>8 Q And then paragraph 88, "Kiesler offered no</p> <p>9 explanation for this new time constraint." Do</p> <p>10 you see that as well?</p> <p>11 A I do.</p> <p>12 Q Didn't you just tell Mark Goff that Kiesler did</p> <p>13 give a explanation for the new time constraint?</p> <p>14 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection.</p> <p>15 Mischaracterizes the documents.</p> <p>16 THE WITNESS: Yes, I did.</p> <p>17 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>18 Q You then said to Mr. Goff, "Now I have time to</p> <p>19 talk to Scott Spangler on Monday to see what he</p> <p>20 thinks I should do. Kiesler now knows I don't</p> <p>21 trust he or Reed, and I don't believe they have</p> <p>22 my best interest in mind at all. I could tell</p> <p>23 he was in disbelief, and I could hear some</p> <p>24 sadness in his voice. So that's where we are</p> <p>25 sitting at this moment. Things will be changing</p>
Page 290	Page 292
<p>1 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>2 Q Yeah.</p> <p>3 A Absolutely not.</p> <p>4 Q You wrote, "What he told me was that he had just</p> <p>5 received an email saying the government has</p> <p>6 pushed back the deadline for another week so he</p> <p>7 doesn't need my answer today after all." Do you</p> <p>8 see that?</p> <p>9 A Yes.</p> <p>10 Q Didn't you say on your Complaint that</p> <p>11 Mr. Kiesler didn't provide any reason for why</p> <p>12 you got additional time to consider the offer?</p> <p>13 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. And,</p> <p>14 Stacy, if you need to look at the Complaint to see</p> <p>15 what was said, you can take the time you need to do</p> <p>16 that.</p> <p>17 THE WITNESS: Can you repeat that</p> <p>18 question or comment?</p> <p>19 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>20 Q Sure. Why don't you go first to page 15 of your</p> <p>21 Complaint. Paragraph 86 to start.</p> <p>22 A Okay.</p> <p>23 Q Paragraph 86 reads, "Stacy decided not to call</p> <p>24 Kiesler back; however, a few minutes before the</p> <p>25 three-hour deadline ran Kiesler called Stacy</p>	<p>1 daily I am sure. I will keep you posted. I'm</p> <p>2 going to need your knowledge on how to make my</p> <p>3 money grow. Thank you for your time, Mark."</p> <p>4 Did I read that accurately?</p> <p>5 A Yes, you did.</p> <p>6 Q It seems like you weren't feeling much pressure</p> <p>7 as a result of this situation based on your</p> <p>8 statements to Mr. Goff, wouldn't you agree with</p> <p>9 that, Ms. Randall?</p> <p>10 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Form.</p> <p>11 THE WITNESS: What are you talking</p> <p>12 about pressure?</p> <p>13 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>14 Q Why did you say, "Kiesler now knows I don't</p> <p>15 trust he or Reed"?</p> <p>16 A I had a lot of pressure on me. I really --</p> <p>17 these days were so stressful because I knew</p> <p>18 nothing.</p> <p>19 Q So why did you tell Mr. Goff that Kiesler knows</p> <p>20 you don't trust he or Reed?</p> <p>21 A Maybe I just thought that because of the way --</p> <p>22 the tone of his voice.</p> <p>23 Q And was that true that you didn't trust Mike or</p> <p>24 Reed as a result of that situation?</p> <p>25 A I was beginning to question it.</p>

Page 293	Page 295
<p>1 Q Certainly no reason to believe that you would 2 tell Goff that if it wasn't true, correct? 3 A Yes. 4 Q Did you, in fact, get in touch with Scott 5 Spangler on Monday like you said you were going 6 to? 7 A That I can't remember, and if I did, he would 8 have said -- I don't know what he would have 9 said. 10 Q You agree that between the time that you wrote 11 this text to Mark Goff on May the 6th and the 12 time that you eventually signed the redemption 13 agreement that a week passed, right? 14 A Yes. 15 Q Did you change how you felt about trusting Reed 16 and Mike in that weeks' time frame? 17 A Yes. 18 Q Why? 19 A Just the way that Mike Kiesler was talking to 20 me. 21 Q That made you trust him more or trust him less? 22 A I had the utmost trust and respect in Mike 23 Kiesler until this, and I can't identify why. I 24 have been told that I'm a good people reader, 25 and so far pretty much what I think is what --</p>	<p>1 to signing the redemption agreements, correct? 2 A Justin thought he knew somebody, but this person 3 did not have the time to do what he was asking. 4 Q So the answer is, yes, you did not do that 5 between your conversation -- 6 A I did not do that. 7 Q -- with Justin and when you signed the 8 redemption agreements? 9 A Correct. 10 Q Isn't it true that none of the deadlines that 11 you have complained about in your Complaint 12 related to the redemption in May were actually 13 enforced by any of the defendants? 14 A Like the three days and the three hours? 15 Q Yeah. 16 A There's a reason why Mike Kiesler called me at 17 3:58. So like I said, I thought that he was 18 calling me to pressure me for an answer. 19 Q And then he didn't, correct? 20 A Correct. So those to me were, hmm, I wonder why 21 he did that. Those three hours were hell. 22 We're talking about my stock and my life. 23 Q And is it your understanding that you didn't 24 have an ability not to sign any agreement? 25 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Object to the form of</p>
Page 294	Page 296
<p>1 when people ask me it's been true. 2 Q Just for the record, you said you trusted Mike 3 Kiesler until this and you pointed at the table. 4 What do you mean until which -- 5 A I meant until this whole thing started. 6 Q The lawsuit, you mean? 7 A Yes. 8 Q And when you say that you trusted Mike Kiesler 9 until the lawsuit, you trusted Mike Kiesler 10 until you found out that the company sold for 11 162 million dollars; is that what you mean? 12 A Yeah. 13 Q You said that your son Justin was suggesting 14 that you hire an attorney, correct? 15 A He did suggest that. 16 Q And Justin also suggested that you obtain 17 counsel to find out what the companies were 18 worth. Is that what you testified to? 19 A No. 20 Q You said something about Justin suggesting that 21 you have the books checked out or the financials 22 checked out? 23 A Yes. Find an attorney to look at the financial 24 books. 25 Q And it's true that you never had that done prior</p>	<p>1 the question. 2 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 3 Q Do you understand what I'm asking? 4 A Not really. 5 Q Couldn't you have just not signed? 6 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for 7 speculation. 8 THE WITNESS: If I was financially 9 stable, I probably wouldn't have signed. 10 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 11 Q No one was holding the pen and forcing you to 12 sign, correct? 13 A Nobody was holding the pen and forcing me to 14 sign. 15 Q And in fact, you had other assets that you could 16 have redeemed instead of the stocks, correct? 17 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for 18 speculation. Calls for a legal conclusion. 19 THE WITNESS: Are you talking about my 20 silver and my gold? 21 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 22 Q Silver and your gold is some, right? You could 23 have redeemed those? 24 A Like I said, I never even thought about it. 25 Q But you could have which you also said, correct?</p>

Page 297	Page 299
<p>1 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for 2 speculation. Calls for legal conclusion. 3 THE WITNESS: If I thought about it, 4 but I wouldn't have. 5 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 6 Q And you could have sold your condos in the 7 Cottage Grove area, correct? 8 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for 9 speculation. Calls for a legal conclusion. 10 THE WITNESS: This is May of 20 -- 11 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 12 Q May of 2020. 13 A I didn't want to have anything to do with those 14 condos. 15 Q But you could have sold them? 16 A I don't -- 17 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Hold on. Objection. 18 Calls for speculation and calls for a legal 19 conclusion. 20 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 21 Q What's your answer, Ms. Randall? 22 A I don't know if I could have or not. 23 (Exhibit No. <u>26</u> was marked.) 24 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 25 Q Ms. Randall, you have been handed what's been</p>	<p>1 exchanges with Scott Spangler regarding tax 2 information? 3 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Object. Vague as to 4 time. 5 THE WITNESS: With Scott Spangler 6 talking about tax information? 7 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 8 Q Yes. 9 A Yes. He was my accountant. 10 Q And I said ever meaning ever. Did you ever have 11 an exchange with Scott Spangler on tax 12 information? 13 A He explained my taxes to me every year. 14 Q Did you know in November of 2018 that Steven 15 Randall was communicating regarding your K-1 16 with Scott Spangler? 17 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. It 18 assumes facts not in evidence. 19 THE WITNESS: No. I did not know 20 that. 21 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 22 Q When Steven was dealing with tax issues, he was 23 acting on your behalf; isn't that correct? 24 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for 25 a legal conclusion and also foundation.</p>
Page 298	Page 300
<p>1 marked for identification as Exhibit <u>26</u> to your 2 deposition, and it's a document produced by you 3 Randall403 through 405. Do you have that in 4 front of you? 5 A Yes, I do. 6 Q And this was a document that I found out was an 7 example of a communication that you had with 8 Scott Spangler. Do you see him listed at the 9 top of the first page of the exhibit? 10 MS. POLAKOWSKI: I will object to form 11 and foundation. Also it mischaracterizes the 12 document. I'm not seeing Stacy's name anywhere on 13 these documents. 14 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 15 Q So this is a communication between -- at the top 16 it's between Steve and Scott Spangler. Do you 17 see that? I'm sorry, on the very first page. I 18 said your name, but it's actually Steven's name. 19 Do you see that? 20 A Yes. 21 Q And then there's a PDF that's got your name and 22 the title of the PDF. Do you see that at the 23 top? 24 A Yes. 25 Q Did you ever have any involvement in the</p>	<p>1 THE WITNESS: We were still married, 2 so, yes. 3 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 4 Q Let me go back quickly to Exhibit <u>25</u>. This was 5 your last text that I showed you to Mark Goff. 6 Do you have that one? 7 A Yes, I do. 8 Q Near the second to bottom line you texted, 9 "Things will be changing daily I am sure." Do 10 you see that? 11 A Yes, I do. 12 Q Do you remember why you said that? 13 A Because I was being told different things. 14 Q Did you anticipate there would be more 15 negotiations with Mike Kiesler? 16 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Form. 17 Vague as to negotiations. 18 THE WITNESS: I don't know if that's 19 what I meant or what I -- 20 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 21 Q Did you remember at the time that Mike Kiesler 22 had told you that he needed to update the figure 23 for the redemption with December 2019 24 financials? 25 A I do not remember him telling me that.</p>

Page 301	Page 303
<p>1 (Exhibit No. <u>27</u> was marked.) 2 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 3 Q Ms. Randall, you have been handed what's been 4 marked for identification as Exhibit <u>27</u> to your 5 deposition. It's a document produced by you in 6 this case, Randall178 through Randall187. 7 A It's a -- what did you say? 8 Q I was reading the Bates numbers. 9 A Okay. 10 Q So I gave you -- the front page should be 11 Randall178 and that back page should be 12 Randall187. 13 A Okay. Yes. 14 Q Do you recognize this document? 15 A No. 16 Q For the record, it's a document titled, "Widen 17 Financial Statements Consolidated December 31, 18 2019," and I'm interested in knowing when you 19 obtained this document, if you know, since it 20 was produced by you in this case. 21 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Object. Foundation. 22 THE WITNESS: Produced by me? 23 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 24 Q Yeah. Remember that process we were talking 25 about before where I said there were document</p>	<p>1 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 2 Q I will keep reading. Let's see if I can jog 3 your memory. "Stacy did not want to accept 4 Keisler's offer so despite her financial 5 situation she allowed the three-day time limit 6 to lapse without responding." Do you see that? 7 A Yes. 8 Q And then you allege that, "On or around May 13 9 Kiesler called Stacy again." Do you see that? 10 A Yes. 11 Q What do you remember about that conversation? 12 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Mark, I apologize can 13 you orient me? 14 MR. CHURCHILL: Sure. Paragraph 94. 15 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Thank you. 16 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 17 Q What do you remember about Mike calling you on 18 May 13? This is when you wrote that he had come 19 up with another \$250,000. 20 A He told me, guess what, I have more good news. 21 He told me that they found another 250,000. 22 Q Isn't it true that Mr. Kiesler told you that he 23 was just updating the formula for the December 24 2019 financials? 25 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection.</p>
Page 302	Page 304
<p>1 requests served on you, and then I asked you if 2 you had searched for documents. 3 A Yes. 4 Q I'm wondering if you have this document or if 5 this document was provided to you actually from 6 the defendants. 7 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. 8 Foundation. 9 THE WITNESS: I don't remember 10 anything about this. 11 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 12 Q Have you ever seen it before today? 13 A No. 14 Q Okay. You can put that to the side. Let's go 15 back to your Complaint so we can walk through 16 the rest of the timeline here. On -- in 17 paragraph 93 on page 16. Are you there? 18 A Yes. 19 Q Paragraph 93 reads, "Stacy did not want to 20 accept Kiesler's offer," and by that you mean 21 the offer from May the 6th, the 1.1 million; is 22 that what you meant by that? 23 A "Stacy did not want" -- 24 MS. POLAKOWSKI: I will object to form 25 and foundation.</p>	<p>1 Mischaracterizes her testimony. 2 THE WITNESS: I don't remember that at 3 all. 4 BY MR. CHURCHILL: 5 Q Do you remember saying something to him along 6 the lines of, "That's more like it," when you 7 found out about the 250,000? 8 A No. I said, "That's all?" 9 Q And so the offer that was made then was in 10 excess of 1.3 million dollars for the rest of 11 your stock, correct? 12 A Yes. 13 Q Ms. Randall, if you were so upset about the 14 amount of money being offered, why didn't you 15 turn it down? 16 A I was told I had to take it or leave it, and 17 they didn't know when they could give me money 18 if they could give me money. 19 Q So why didn't you leave it? 20 A I didn't have any money. 21 Q That's not been your testimony today. You 22 testified that you had other assets and other 23 money. 24 MS. POLAKOWSKI: I will object to the 25 form of the question. It mischaracterizes her</p>

Page 305	Page 307
<p>1 testimony.</p> <p>2 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>3 Q Isn't it true that you had other assets that you</p> <p>4 could have redeemed and not had to sell your</p> <p>5 stock?</p> <p>6 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for</p> <p>7 speculation.</p> <p>8 THE WITNESS: No.</p> <p>9 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>10 Q That's not true?</p> <p>11 A No.</p> <p>12 Q Isn't it true that you knew that this did not</p> <p>13 involve Milmont, which was a different asset</p> <p>14 that you could have redeemed instead?</p> <p>15 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Object to the form of</p> <p>16 the question. Also calls for speculation.</p> <p>17 THE WITNESS: I didn't think about it.</p> <p>18 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>19 Q But you knew Milmont wasn't one of -- wasn't</p> <p>20 being discussed with respect to the stock</p> <p>21 redemption, correct?</p> <p>22 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection.</p> <p>23 Speculation. Calls for -- excuse me, just one</p> <p>24 second. Foundation.</p> <p>25 THE WITNESS: What do you mean by --</p>	<p>1 the question. Mischaracterizes the document.</p> <p>2 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>3 Q Are you following me, Ms. Randall?</p> <p>4 A Yes, I am.</p> <p>5 Q Who are the people that you reached out to that</p> <p>6 are referenced in paragraph 97 of your</p> <p>7 Complaint?</p> <p>8 A Wealth management would be Mark Goff.</p> <p>9 Q And then personal accountant would be Scott</p> <p>10 Spangler?</p> <p>11 A Yes.</p> <p>12 Q Anybody else?</p> <p>13 A I do not believe so.</p> <p>14 Q And then you reached out to your attorney,</p> <p>15 right, your divorce Attorney Ms. Collins O'Hara?</p> <p>16 A Yes, I did.</p> <p>17 Q In paragraph 105 -- strike that.</p> <p>18 Let's back up a little bit to orient</p> <p>19 you. Paragraph 103, let's start with -- of the</p> <p>20 Complaint on page 17 -- "Stacy then emailed</p> <p>21 Attorney B with a frantic subject line, 'I need</p> <p>22 help.'" Do you see that?</p> <p>23 A Yes.</p> <p>24 Q And do you remember who Attorney B was?</p> <p>25 A It would be Amy.</p>
Page 306	Page 308
<p>1 who discussed?</p> <p>2 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>3 Q When you were having the discussion with Mike</p> <p>4 Kiesler --</p> <p>5 A Yes.</p> <p>6 Q -- on May the 6th and then again on May the 13th</p> <p>7 you knew this was not a discussion about</p> <p>8 Milmont, correct?</p> <p>9 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Object to the form of</p> <p>10 the question. Vague.</p> <p>11 THE WITNESS: Right.</p> <p>12 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>13 Q Okay. In paragraph 97, again, of the Complaint</p> <p>14 page 16 it states, "Frantic for advice, Stacy</p> <p>15 contacted friends in the wealth management</p> <p>16 industry and her personal accountant, but nobody</p> <p>17 could provide advice before Kiesler's deadline</p> <p>18 lapsed." Do you see that?</p> <p>19 A Yes.</p> <p>20 Q So is it true then that you did reach out to</p> <p>21 additional people after getting off the</p> <p>22 telephone with Mike Kiesler?</p> <p>23 A I reached out to Mark Goff.</p> <p>24 Q Again? On May 13?</p> <p>25 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Object to the form of</p>	<p>1 Q And you -- then it says, "Stacy told Attorney B</p> <p>2 that Kiesler had just called her and apparently</p> <p>3 revised his valuation of Windy Waters, but that</p> <p>4 because of the COVID thing I have to sign these</p> <p>5 papers today, like now." Do you see that?</p> <p>6 A Yes.</p> <p>7 Q So you knew that you were going to see some</p> <p>8 papers?</p> <p>9 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Object to the form of</p> <p>10 the question.</p> <p>11 THE WITNESS: I knew that I was going</p> <p>12 to be seeing -- I had to sign some papers today.</p> <p>13 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>14 Q You expected to see -- if you were going to do</p> <p>15 the deal, you expected to see a redemption</p> <p>16 agreement again, correct?</p> <p>17 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection</p> <p>18 mischaracterizes her testimony.</p> <p>19 THE WITNESS: No. I did not expect to</p> <p>20 see that.</p> <p>21 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>22 Q What papers did you think you were going to need</p> <p>23 to see?</p> <p>24 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection.</p> <p>25 Mischaracterizes the document.</p>

Page 309	Page 311
<p>1 THE WITNESS: I didn't know.</p> <p>2 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>3 Q Did you think to ask to see the papers that you</p> <p>4 might have to sign prior to signing them?</p> <p>5 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Object to the form of</p> <p>6 the question. It's vague.</p> <p>7 THE WITNESS: Can you repeat that?</p> <p>8 MR. CHURCHILL: Would you read it</p> <p>9 back, please?</p> <p>10 (Last question read back.)</p> <p>11 THE WITNESS: No. I did not think of</p> <p>12 that.</p> <p>13 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>14 Q Isn't it true that you agreed with Mike Kiesler</p> <p>15 that Scott Seid would draft up papers for you to</p> <p>16 sign for the May 2020 redemption agreement?</p> <p>17 A That's not true.</p> <p>18 Q You didn't agree for Scott Seid to draft those</p> <p>19 papers?</p> <p>20 A I knew nothing about Scott Seid.</p> <p>21 Q Well, that's not true because in paragraph 102</p> <p>22 you admit you called and left Scott Seid a</p> <p>23 message.</p> <p>24 A Right. But I did not know that he was going to</p> <p>25 be drafting papers.</p>	<p>1 Rosenbaum firm would be handling redemptions of</p> <p>2 your stock?</p> <p>3 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection to the</p> <p>4 extent it mischaracterizes the document and calls for</p> <p>5 a legal conclusion. Also vague as to timing.</p> <p>6 THE WITNESS: I know that I signed the</p> <p>7 paper.</p> <p>8 MS. POLAKOWSKI: And, Stacy, if you</p> <p>9 need to look at the waiver letter to determine what</p> <p>10 it says, go ahead and take the time that you need to</p> <p>11 do that.</p> <p>12 THE WITNESS: Yeah. Where is that?</p> <p>13 MR. CHURCHILL: It should be Exhibit</p> <p>14 <u>17</u>.</p> <p>15 MR. PALAY: Mark, I just want to ask</p> <p>16 you a question about this document when it's a good</p> <p>17 time, so just let me know.</p> <p>18 MR. CHURCHILL: Sure.</p> <p>19 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>20 Q All right. So second sentence, first paragraph</p> <p>21 of Exhibit <u>17</u> letter to you from Amy T. Collins,</p> <p>22 "As you know, we also represent Windy Waters,</p> <p>23 Inc., (the company) in unrelated corporate</p> <p>24 matters including your redemption of shares of</p> <p>25 the company." Do you see that?</p>
Page 310	Page 312
<p>1 Q That never came up?</p> <p>2 A Are you asking me if Mike Kiesler ever told me</p> <p>3 that Scott Seid was going to draft papers?</p> <p>4 Q Isn't it true that you and Mike Kiesler agreed</p> <p>5 that Scott Seid would draft up the papers for</p> <p>6 you to review and sign?</p> <p>7 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection.</p> <p>8 Mischaracterizes her testimony.</p> <p>9 THE WITNESS: No, that's not true.</p> <p>10 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>11 Q Ultimately you left Scott Seid a voicemail,</p> <p>12 right?</p> <p>13 A Yes, I did.</p> <p>14 Q And was it your understanding at the time that</p> <p>15 Mr. Seid could advise you with respect to the</p> <p>16 potential redemption of your shares?</p> <p>17 A Yes, it was.</p> <p>18 Q And that's true even though you had signed a</p> <p>19 conflict waiver earlier saying that you knew</p> <p>20 that the Stafford Rosenbaum firm was handling</p> <p>21 the redemptions of your shares for the company?</p> <p>22 A I did not know that Rosenbaum was doing --</p> <p>23 writing redemption things.</p> <p>24 Q You remember that you signed that conflict</p> <p>25 waiver that says expressly that the Stafford</p>	<p>1 A Yes.</p> <p>2 Q Okay. Do you now recall that you waived that</p> <p>3 conflict and therefore knew that Stafford</p> <p>4 Rosenbaum was representing Windy Waters in the</p> <p>5 redemption of your shares?</p> <p>6 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection.</p> <p>7 Mischaracterizes the document. Also calls for a</p> <p>8 legal conclusion.</p> <p>9 THE WITNESS: I don't think that I had</p> <p>10 enough information to say that.</p> <p>11 MR. CHURCHILL: Why don't we take a</p> <p>12 break?</p> <p>13 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Going off the</p> <p>14 record. The time is 6:29 p.m.</p> <p>15 (Brief recess taken.)</p> <p>16 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the</p> <p>17 record. The time is 6:44 p.m.</p> <p>18 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>19 Q Ms. Randall, you got off the phone with</p> <p>20 Ms. O'Hara and then ultimately made the decision</p> <p>21 to go to Widens offices, correct?</p> <p>22 A That is right.</p> <p>23 Q Did Mike Kiesler know you were coming?</p> <p>24 A Yes.</p> <p>25 (Exhibit No. <u>28</u> was marked.)</p>

Page 313

1 BY MR. CHURCHILL:
2 Q Ms. Randall, you have been handed what's been
3 marked for identification as Exhibit 28 to your
4 deposition. And this is a text from you to
5 Justin sent at 3:56 p.m. on May 13. Do you see
6 that?
7 A Yes.
8 Q And you wrote, "Well lo and behold, Kiesler did
9 another evaluation of the company and came up
10 with another 250,000." Do you see that?
11 A Yes.
12 Q "Nothing I can do about it. I will be going
13 over to the office to sign the papers at 4:30."
14 Do you see that?
15 A Yes.
16 Q Why did you say, "Nothing I can do about it"?
17 A He made it perfectly clear to me there is
18 nothing I can do about it.
19 Q So you already knew before you went to the
20 offices that you were going to sign?
21 A I felt like I had to sign.
22 Q And you hadn't reviewed what you were calling
23 the papers yet, correct?
24 A Correct.
25 Q When you arrived at the office, you saw Mike

Page 314

1 Kiesler on his phone, correct?
2 A Yes.
3 Q And he was talking to Scott Seid?
4 A Yes.
5 Q And you asked Mike if you could speak to Scott
6 Seid, correct?
7 A That's right.
8 Q And Mike handed you his phone; isn't that right?
9 A Yes.
10 Q And in the course of talking with Scott Seid on
11 the telephone you indicated that you were
12 uncomfortable redeeming your shares?
13 A Yes, I did.
14 Q And isn't it true that Scott Seid said to you
15 that nobody could force you to sign any
16 documents?
17 A Yes.
18 Q And isn't it also true that Scott Seid offered
19 to provide you names of attorneys that could
20 advise you if you wanted them?
21 A That is not true.
22 Q Are you aware that Scott Seid gave a deposition
23 in this case?
24 A Yes, I am.
25 Q And are you aware that he testified to the fact

Page 315

1 that he gave you -- that he offered to give you
2 names of attorneys in that phone conversation?
3 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Object to the extent
4 it assumes facts not in evidence.
5 THE WITNESS: Am I aware of the fact
6 that he says he did?
7 BY MR. CHURCHILL:
8 Q Yes.
9 A No.
10 Q Is it possible that you don't remember that
11 Scott Seid offered to give you attorneys names?
12 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for
13 speculation.
14 THE WITNESS: I honestly don't believe
15 that he did.
16 BY MR. CHURCHILL:
17 Q So do you believe that Scott Seid is lying?
18 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Object to the form of
19 the question. Foundation. Calls for speculation.
20 THE WITNESS: I wouldn't call it
21 lying. I just think he doesn't remember.
22 (Exhibit No. 29 was marked.)
23 BY MR. CHURCHILL:
24 Q Ms. Randall, the court reporter has now handed
25 you what's been marked for identification as

Page 316

1 Exhibit 29 to your deposition.
2 A Okay.
3 Q It's Bates labeled Windy2919 through 2924. Do
4 you recognize this as your May 13, 2020,
5 redemption agreement?
6 A No.
7 Q Do you see on the first page the date, May 13,
8 2020, up at the top?
9 A On the first page?
10 Q Yes. At the top of the first page, "13th day of
11 May 2020." Do you see that up top?
12 A Yes, I do.
13 Q And do you see your signature on page 3?
14 A Yes, I do.
15 Q And do you also see a Promissory Note attached
16 to the agreement?
17 A I see that.
18 Q And do you see that amount listed as
19 \$1,352,166.31?
20 A Yes, I see that.
21 Q And you agree that this is the agreement that
22 you entered into for the redemption of the
23 remaining shares that you had in Windy Waters
24 corporation?
25 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Form.

Page 317	Page 319
<p>1 Calls for a legal conclusion.</p> <p>2 THE WITNESS: I can't be exactly sure.</p> <p>3 I didn't really look at it.</p> <p>4 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>5 Q Did you review this document at all before</p> <p>6 signing it?</p> <p>7 A No, I did not.</p> <p>8 Q Do you remember Mike Kiesler reading through the</p> <p>9 Stock Redemption Agreement for you line by line?</p> <p>10 A No.</p> <p>11 Q Do you remember Mike Kiesler reading the</p> <p>12 Promissory Note for you line by line?</p> <p>13 A No, I do not.</p> <p>14 Q Do you remember Mike Kiesler asking whether you</p> <p>15 understood the contents as he read through both</p> <p>16 documents to you?</p> <p>17 A He did not read.</p> <p>18 Q Did you pay any attention to paragraph 5 or</p> <p>19 section 5 on page 2 of Exhibit <u>29</u> titled</p> <p>20 "Release"?</p> <p>21 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Object to the form of</p> <p>22 the question. Also assumes facts not in evidence.</p> <p>23 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>24 Q Do you remember noticing that at all when you</p> <p>25 were with Mr. Kiesler before signing the</p>	<p>1 Q Would you say that you treated this document the</p> <p>2 same way that you treated the other redemption</p> <p>3 agreements, that you skimmed it?</p> <p>4 A No. I did not skim it.</p> <p>5 Q You didn't even skim this document?</p> <p>6 A No, I did not.</p> <p>7 Q Even though you knew that you were redeeming the</p> <p>8 rest of your shares in the company?</p> <p>9 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Object to the form of</p> <p>10 the question. It assumes facts not in evidence. It</p> <p>11 also calls for a legal conclusion.</p> <p>12 THE WITNESS: I was just -- I felt</p> <p>13 totally pressured to sign this. So I don't know what</p> <p>14 I thought.</p> <p>15 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>16 Q Mr. Kiesler didn't say that you couldn't leave,</p> <p>17 correct?</p> <p>18 A No. He didn't say that.</p> <p>19 Q Mr. Kiesler didn't give you a specific time</p> <p>20 frame for when you had to sign on that day, did</p> <p>21 he?</p> <p>22 A He told me I had to be there at 4:30 to sign.</p> <p>23 Q Did he give you an end time when you had to</p> <p>24 leave?</p> <p>25 A I don't recall.</p>
Page 318	Page 320
<p>1 document?</p> <p>2 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Also object to the</p> <p>3 extent it mischaracterizes her testimony.</p> <p>4 THE WITNESS: I -- no.</p> <p>5 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>6 Q You don't remember?</p> <p>7 A Huh-uh.</p> <p>8 Q Would it have been important for you to review</p> <p>9 this document prior to signing it?</p> <p>10 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Object to the form of</p> <p>11 the question. Calls for a legal conclusion.</p> <p>12 THE WITNESS: Would it be important to</p> <p>13 me?</p> <p>14 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>15 Q Yeah.</p> <p>16 A Well, he explained -- now that I'm rereading</p> <p>17 this, he explained to me what he wanted me to</p> <p>18 know.</p> <p>19 Q So you felt like you didn't need to review it</p> <p>20 because he explained it for you?</p> <p>21 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection.</p> <p>22 Mischaracterizes her testimony.</p> <p>23 THE WITNESS: Again, I trusted Mike</p> <p>24 Kiesler. I thought he was being honest with me.</p> <p>25 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p>	<p>1 Q Did you ask him for any financial documents in</p> <p>2 that meeting?</p> <p>3 A No.</p> <p>4 Q In paragraph 117 of your Complaint, Ms. Randall,</p> <p>5 it says, "Stacy" --</p> <p>6 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Hold on. Let me get</p> <p>7 it in front of her.</p> <p>8 MR. CHURCHILL: Sure.</p> <p>9 MS. POLAKOWSKI: It's right here,</p> <p>10 Stacy.</p> <p>11 THE WITNESS: Okay.</p> <p>12 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>13 Q So on page 18 paragraph 117 that reads, "Stacy</p> <p>14 asked Kiesler whether he and the companies'</p> <p>15 executives were preparing to sell Widen</p> <p>16 Enterprises." Do you see that?</p> <p>17 A Yes.</p> <p>18 Q And what, to the best of your recollection, were</p> <p>19 the words that you actually used?</p> <p>20 A That I used?</p> <p>21 Q Yes.</p> <p>22 A I asked him if there was any thought about</p> <p>23 selling the company.</p> <p>24 Q Did you say, "Are the companies' executives</p> <p>25 preparing to sell Widen Enterprises"?</p>

Page 321	Page 323
<p>1 A No.</p> <p>2 Q So tell me what it is you think you remember</p> <p>3 asking exactly.</p> <p>4 A Are you -- is there any thought about selling</p> <p>5 the company.</p> <p>6 Q And in paragraph 118 in the Complaint there's</p> <p>7 quotes around the statement, "No, there's been</p> <p>8 no talk of that." Do you see that?</p> <p>9 A Yes.</p> <p>10 Q And is that quoted because you recall that</p> <p>11 that's exactly what Mike Kiesler said?</p> <p>12 A Yes.</p> <p>13 Q Would you turn to paragraph 50 of the Complaint</p> <p>14 which is on page 11? Are you there?</p> <p>15 A Yes.</p> <p>16 Q Paragraph 50 reads, "During this period" -- and</p> <p>17 the period is in the prior paragraph. Do you</p> <p>18 see the date February 2020?</p> <p>19 A Yes, I do.</p> <p>20 Q "During this period Reed made statements to</p> <p>21 third parties to the effect that Widen</p> <p>22 Enterprises regularly receives solicitations and</p> <p>23 offers from potential acquirers and that he was</p> <p>24 considering selling Widen Enterprises because he</p> <p>25 could personally receive 80 million dollars for</p>	<p>1 Widen Enterprises within the next year?</p> <p>2 MS. POLAKOWSKI: And, Stacy, I will</p> <p>3 caution you, as has been true throughout the day, if</p> <p>4 you have to rely on conversations that you have had</p> <p>5 with us as counsel in order to answer that question,</p> <p>6 I will instruct you not to answer.</p> <p>7 THE WITNESS: I need an explanation on</p> <p>8 what you -- what you're asking me. Can you rephrase?</p> <p>9 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>10 Q Sure. I will try to rephrase it. Do you have</p> <p>11 any basis for asserting that your brother, Reed</p> <p>12 Widen, was telling people that he was</p> <p>13 considering selling the company within a year of</p> <p>14 February 2020?</p> <p>15 A No, I don't.</p> <p>16 (Exhibit Nos. <u>30</u> and <u>31</u> were marked.)</p> <p>17 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>18 Q So, Ms. Randall, I have handed you what's been</p> <p>19 marked for identification as Exhibit <u>30</u> and <u>31</u></p> <p>20 to your deposition, and we will end with these</p> <p>21 today. Exhibit <u>30</u> is a text between you and</p> <p>22 Mike Kiesler. Do you see that?</p> <p>23 A Yes, I do.</p> <p>24 Q And it's September of 2020. Do you see that?</p> <p>25 A Yes, I do.</p>
Page 322	Page 324
<p>1 his ownership interest in Widen Enterprises,</p> <p>2 implying a fair market value of Widen</p> <p>3 Enterprises of at least 100 million dollars."</p> <p>4 Do you see that?</p> <p>5 A Yes.</p> <p>6 Q Is it my understanding that the basis for that</p> <p>7 allegation in paragraph 50 is statements that</p> <p>8 your son says that he heard?</p> <p>9 A My son was told that.</p> <p>10 Q And what is it -- I know your son is not here,</p> <p>11 but what is your understanding of what your son</p> <p>12 heard exactly?</p> <p>13 A I'm not exactly sure what he heard.</p> <p>14 Q Okay. This is your Complaint, and you're making</p> <p>15 the allegation. So what is it you believe --</p> <p>16 what is it that you're saying that your brother</p> <p>17 was saying in February of 2020?</p> <p>18 A He told Justin that -- I'm not sure. I wasn't</p> <p>19 there. I don't know what Reed said.</p> <p>20 Q Okay. So you're relying on your son Justin for</p> <p>21 that allegation in the Complaint?</p> <p>22 A Yes.</p> <p>23 Q Do you have any basis to believe that your</p> <p>24 brother was stating to anyone in the February</p> <p>25 2020 time frame that he was considering selling</p>	<p>1 Q And you say, "Hey, dude. I hope you are doing</p> <p>2 well. Fucking asshole and I have a mediation</p> <p>3 tomorrow morning at 9:00. " You mean Steven</p> <p>4 Randall by that reference?</p> <p>5 A Yes, I do.</p> <p>6 Q And you ask Mike, "Could you temporarily lower</p> <p>7 the monthly payment I am receiving right now or</p> <p>8 adjust it to say 10 or 11K per month. My</p> <p>9 thought being I would not be able to afford to</p> <p>10 continue giving him \$4,000 a month. I shouldn't</p> <p>11 have to anyway." Do you see that?</p> <p>12 A Yes, I do.</p> <p>13 Q Did Mike Kiesler adjust the promissory note to</p> <p>14 reduce the amount of money you were receiving?</p> <p>15 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection.</p> <p>16 Foundation.</p> <p>17 THE WITNESS: I don't recall him even</p> <p>18 responding to this.</p> <p>19 BY MR. CHURCHILL:</p> <p>20 Q Okay. And did you adjust how much that you had</p> <p>21 to pay your ex-husband, or did you keep on</p> <p>22 having to pay him the same amount of 4,000?</p> <p>23 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Calls for</p> <p>24 a legal conclusion.</p> <p>25 THE WITNESS: I was told at that</p>

Page 325

1 meeting that he -- they were denying his \$6,000 a
2 month and they are going to do 4,000.
3 BY MR. CHURCHILL:
4 Q Last document then, Exhibit 31, June 15, 2020.
5 It's a little earlier. Again, to Mike you
6 wrote, "Hi, Mike. Are you trying to get me
7 killed? Let me know if I'm mistaken please. I
8 was under the impression that I would get my
9 checks on the 13th of every month. I realize
10 that was Saturday. I thought it would show up
11 today. Problem is I am supposed to be giving a
12 fucking \$4,000 check to fucking asshole on the
13 15th of each month. The check has not hit my
14 bank yet. I love that I can't pay him today.
15 Ha ha ha. I guess he isn't very happy."
16 This is in reference to the check that's
17 being discussed here in reference to the payment
18 that was supposed to be made under the May 13,
19 2020, redemption agreement, correct?
20 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection.
21 Foundation.
22 BY MR. CHURCHILL:
23 Q So this is June 2020. And you were expecting a
24 check, right, from the May redemption agreement?
25 MS. POLAKOWSKI: Objection. Misstates

Page 326

1 her testimony.
2 THE WITNESS: I can't say that I was
3 expecting it.
4 BY MR. CHURCHILL:
5 Q Is it fair to say that you and your brother Reed
6 engaged in colorful language at times?
7 A Oh, yes.
8 MS. POLAKOWSKI: I think we're all
9 done.
10 MR. CHURCHILL: I think I'm out of
11 time.
12 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: There being nothing
13 further, this will conclude the deposition. We will
14 go off the record at 7:02 p.m., and four media units
15 were used.
16 (Proceedings concluded at 7:02 p.m.)
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Page 327

1 STATE OF WISCONSIN)
2 COUNTY OF MILWAUKEE) SS:
3
4
5 I, ALI KORNBURGER, Notary Public in and
6 for the State of Wisconsin, do hereby certify that
7 the above deposition of STACY RANDALL was recorded by
8 me on August 28, 2023, and reduced to writing under
9 my personal direction.
10 I further certify that I am not a
11 relative or employee or attorney or counsel of any of
12 the parties, or a relative or employee of such
13 attorney or counsel, or financially interested
14 directly or indirectly in this action.
15 In witness whereof I have hereunder set
16 my hand and affixed my seal of office at Milwaukee,
17 Wisconsin, this 7th day of September, 2023.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25 My Commission Expires: February 22, 2024.

